DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 129 263 IR 004 040

TITLE	Research Libraries and Cooperative Systems. Minutes of the Semi-Annual Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries (88th, Seattle, Washington, May 6-7, 1976).
INSTITUTION	Association of Research Libraries, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	ISSN-0044-9652
PUB DATE	May 76
NOTE	136p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 ($5.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cataloging; Conference Reports; Costs; *Data Bases; Library Automation; Library Cooperation; *Library Networks; Research Libraries
IDENTIFIERS	ARL; Association of Research Libraries; *Library of Congress; *Research Libraries Group

ABSTRACT

The May, 1976, Association of Research Libraries (ARL) meeting included a variety of presentations on library networks. Susan Martin defined various categories of automated library networks, reviewed potential functions of such networks, and discussed the implications for individual library operations. LeMoyne Anderson listed forces which are moving research libraries toward cooperative arrangements, Richard De Gennaro discussed the specific implications of computerized cataloging networks, and Frederick Kilgour outlined their economic and service advantages. Stanley McElderry described several possible modes of research library response to a national bibliographic center. The Research Libraries Group (RLG) reported on its program to improve service and reduce budget increases through cooperation. The Library of Congress (LC)-RLG computer link and the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science's study of LC's role in a national network were described. Discussion and a short business meeting followed. Appendixes to the minutes include an ARL roster and auditor's report in addition to various task force and commission statements. (KB)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED129263

Research Libraries and Cooperative Systems

Minutes of the Eighty-eighth Meeting

May 6-7, 1976
Seattle, Washington

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IR004040

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CONTENTS

Page

Opening 1

TRENDS IN LIBRARY NETWORKS 2
Susan K. Martin

NEW DYNAMICS OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND NETWORKS 15
Le Moyne Anderson

NETWORKS: CHANGE AGENTS, GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS AND STANDARD COSTS.. 18
Richard De Gennaro

EFFECT OF NETWORKS ON RESEARCH LIBRARIES 24
Federick Kilgour

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND A NATIONAL ACCESS SYSTEM 27
Stanley McElderry

THE RESEARCH LIBRARIES GROUP 37
James Skipper

RLG-LC CONNECTION.. 42
William Welsh

Reactors:
- David Weber 46
- Ray Frantz, Jr. 49

Discussion 49

THE ROLE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS IN NETWORKS 56
Alphonse Trezza

ADVISORY GROUP ON NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL 64
Lawrence Livingston

BUSINESS MEETING 70

- ARL Commission Structure 70
- ARL Membership Criteria 72
- ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards 75
- ARL/CRL Committee on a National Periodicals Lending Library 75
- Office of University Library Management Studies 76
- Report of the Executive Director 79

APPENDICES

Page

A. Report of the Task Force to Study the ARL Commission Structure 85
B. Report of the Subcommittee to Review Criteria for ARL Membership 89
C. Report of the Task Force on Criteria for ARL Membership for Non-university Libraries and Nonlibrary Agencies 92
D.(1). Robert Wessel letter dated 3-31-76 to Alphonse Trezza re. National Periodicals Lending Library 95
D.(2). Virginia Whitney letter dated 4-2-76 to Alphonse Trezza 97
D.(3). ARL/CRL Committee on a National Periodicals Lending Library, Progress Report 99
E. Attendance at the 88th ARL Meeting 103
F. Officers, Board of Directors, Commissions, Committees and Task Forces of the ARL 107
G. Membership of the ARL 112
H. Auditor's Report 119

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Minutes of the 88th Meeting

Virginia P. Whitney, presiding

The Eighty-eight Meeting of the Association of Research Libraries was held at the Washington Plaza Hotel in Seattle, Washington on May 6-7, 1976.

President Virginia Whitney opened the meeting by welcoming and introducing new and alternate representatives attending their first ARL meeting and guests of the Association.

President Whitney then discussed the theme of the program: "Research Libraries and Cooperative Systems."

TRENDS IN LIBRARY NETWORKS

Susan K. Martin

Introduction

VIRGINIA WHITNEY: The title of the conference program is "Research Libraries and Cooperative Systems." This is a follow-up to our program theme of last year, "National Perspectives for ARL Libraries." Library systems have been variously called consortia, cooperatives, and sometimes networks. All have the same or similar goal of enhancing the ability of an individual library by its joining with one or more other libraries or institutions devoted to information transfer, to increase its capacity to serve its own users.

Last Fall, in setting the scene for the splendid program which the Library of Congress and William Welsh put on for us at our meeting, Warren Haas in his opening address gave a history of the relationship of ARL and LC. He stated what he believes will be required in the future. He said this country needs a comprehensive system for the bibliographic control of all recorded information. It needs assured access to required information. It needs imaginative use of technology that now seems capable of making a dramatic transfer possible, and finally, it needs the assurance of the production of new systems with related special staffs being maintained and developed; because without this assurance, the importance of all of our other efforts is degraded.

Certainly this is a statement to which we all subscribe, but we have been going about enhancing our ability to serve our own client groups in a variety of ways. In an effort to give you an overview of what many of these different systems have become or how they are being used, we have invited Ms. Susan Martin, who is the head of the Library Systems Office at the University of California at Berkeley. Ms. Martin was graduated from Tufts University and received a library degree from Simmons. She is probably well known to you as the editor of the Journal of Library Automation. She has extensive knowledge on the topic, and has written extensively. She has generously accepted our invitation today to share this knowledge with us this morning.

* * * *

SUSAN MARTIN: I am delighted to be able to join you and share with you some of my thoughts on automated networks for libraries. I would like to start with a couple of afterthoughts, as a matter of fact. One of them is that a couple of weeks ago, I started worrying about the title of the talk: "Trends in Library Networks" sounds like there is a possibility that I am going to cover all trends in library networks. I just wanted to make it very explicit that there is no way that anyone can cover these trends in library networks, except with perhaps a list of things that are happening, in a half hour or 45 minutes.

The other afterthought is something that Virginia Whitney referred to. At the last meeting, where there was considerable discussion of the Library of Congress and its programs, there was some discussion of national bibliographic control and its effect nationwide. I am not going to refer very much to the Library of Congress in my paper. However, that does not mean that I am not aware that the Library of Congress forms a very important part of the national network scene.

I thought you might be interested to learn what kind of participation you, the ARL libraries, have in on-line networks, so I conducted a little survey with the assistance of Jeffrey Gardner to identify what ARL libraries are doing in on-line processing networks, and I followed it up with an overview of what was happening in on-line data base and reference services. It turns out that approximately 80 percent of the ARL libraries are involved in some kind of on-line processing systems. These are not all networks. Some of them (for instance, the University of Chicago) are single institution on-line processing systems. I was suprised, as was Mr. Gardner, that the number is so high. In addition, the Lockheed Corporation, although not revealing to me the names of customers, had told me that of the list of ARL libraries, 50 to 60 percent of you are customers of the Lockheed Information Service. I have not gotten the same information from the System Development Corporation, but that is probably a good thing, because if I had two percentage figures, I would not know what to do with them.

I have also received from the National Library of Medicine figures that indicate somewhere around 85 percent of ARL libraries benefit either directly or indirectly from on-line services. The reason that I can not be a little more specific about that is that I had to make educated guesses about the participation of ARL libraries in the regional medical centers. As a group, then, you are far from being strangers to networks and on-line systems, and there is no need for a discussion of the general effect of computer technology on an academic library. I had considered a handout which listed some of the major networks but this is a rather difficult thing to put together, I want to call your attention to two publications that exist. One is the System Development Corporation's Directory of Academic Library Consortia, which has just come out in its second edition. The information that it presents is quite good. The indexing is well done. It is, of course, like any hard copy publication, somewhat obsolete at the moment of its publication, so it has that slight deficiency. The other publication is one that is published by Knowledge Industries Corporation. It is entitled Library Networks 1974-75. The first edition was published last year, and there will be another edition published this year.

We will need a definition of "network." In a paper given at an institute on networks about a year ago, Brett Butler presented a definition which applies to the types of networks I am going to focus on. He said that these networks are dependent organizations and systems providing duplex digital distribution. In other words, the networks are cooperative efforts which use interactive computer systems to generate services and products. Mr. Butler made another distinction which we should be aware of before proceeding further: he defined a network organization as being distinct from a network resource. The administrative unit known as NELINET, for example, is a network organization; it uses the OCLC computer system as its major network resource. OCLC is both an organization and a resource, but the two facets of its existence can to a certain extent be identified and separated. Usually when you discuss a network you do not need to go into this kind of differentiation, but sometimes it can be quite useful.

Of the several types of networks, the one which most commonly comes to mind when we think about library networks is the processing network, of which the Ohio College Library Center is the largest, oldest and by some terms of definition, still the only one in the country. Library processing can be assisted by a computerized network as easily as by an on-site locally controlled computer. However, certain benefits accrue from shared processing, and thus far these benefits are being heavily stressed in terms of priorities for further network development.

A second type of network provides data base services. An outstanding example is the MEDLINE system and its offshoots developed by the National Library of Medicine. The data base networks are a little more confusing than the processing networks, both administratively and organizationally. Some are cooperative arrangements; the Northeast Academic Science Information Center, or NASIC, was a project of a cooperative organization and was established to act as a broker for information services to academic libraries. The best known suppliers of data base services are commercial firms, however; the System Development Corporation and Lockheed offer access to multiple data bases, and a large number of data base producers provide services for their own products. Here we no longer retain the "dependent" or cooperative, aspect of our original definition, but the systems are still interactive and computer-based.

A third category of arrangement, commercial services, certainly cannot be as easily described as a type of network but it does share many characteristics with the processing and data base networks just mentioned. Vendors offer a wide variety of services and products: these can be batch mode or on-line; they are often dependent on shared data, with the MARC data base forming the nucleus; and some firms maintain their customers' machine-readable files. To give you an example of the links which are beginning to be made: the University of Texas at Dallas, an OCLC user, receives its bibliographic data on magnetic type (I am not sure whether it is weekly or less often but it does receive the data on tape from OCLC), it sends the tape to Blackwell North America, where its master catalog file is updated and a microfiche catalog produced at intervals. It does not take a vivid imagination to visualize a direct connection, or direct communication of the data between OCLC in Columbus, Ohio, and Blackwell North America, in Portland, Oregon.

I would like to turn now to the topic of applicability of networks to library functions. The scope of library networking has considerable implications for national and international network planning. Almost anything can be automated if enough economic resources can be invested in the development and maintenance of the system. Libraries, as we know, however, are not high on the list of priorities for investment of funds, and network development should incorporate a strategy of "getting the most for one's money," by using a pragmatic approach toward the selection of network applications.

The functions which are best embedded in a computerized network, since they used the communications and computer resources more efficiently and effectively, are those functions, first of all, which are the least subject to local variation, require the smallest number of transactions against the library's files, and gain by use of other institutions' data. Let us examine some typical library functions in the light of these criteria.

There is little doubt that the cataloging function is well-suited to a network operation. A shared-cataloging network such as OCLC provides LC cataloging data to its members. Ideally, the only records which must be input by a library are those which are outside the scope of the MARC Distribution Service and have not yet been cataloged by any other member library. The data base is therefore a mixture of LC MARC records and originally-input records, plus information about additional locations reported whenever a library uses an existing record.

Problems arise from the lack of a standard authority file and the lack of authority control within the shared system: a library may deliberately or inadvertently create a duplicate record for an item already in the data base, because of a divergence of cataloging practice. Another problem of networked cataloging lies in the pricing of services. I will discuss these problems in more detail later; for now, despite these obstacles, it is apparent on the basis of performance that cataloging is a reasonable function of a network.

Acquisitions procedures, with the exception of fiscal control, are similarly adaptable to networking. We must recognize, however, that the nature of the acquisitions process will force "lower quality" data into the data base, since by definition the acquisitions record is temporary and often derived from nonauthoritative sources. Nevertheless, a library may indeed still be able to benefit by using an existing bibliographic record for a purchase order, and some resource-sharing procedures may be implemented between institutions which have agreed to collect in a complementary mode.

Interlibrary loan is obviously suited to on-line networking. Although no formal interlibrary loan system exists in any operational network resource, to my knowledge, it is well-known that OCLC users often consult the data base before embarking on an ILL transaction. Interlibrary loan, cataloging, and acquisitions can all benefit from shared data, and do not represent a very high institutional workload for most institutions.

Networks have limitations as well as benefits. Because a communication process is involved, there can be a bottleneck in the system if too many services are being asked of a single resource. Without adequate telephone lines and communication speeds, the response time of an on-line system can, under a heavy workload, degenerate to the point that the system becomes almost useless. It is necessary, therefore, to identify those functions which are strictly local or which have very high transaction levels. These functions are less suited to networking than those just described.

The circulation function seems in some way appropriate for networking, since it uses bibliographic data which may be shared among institutions and is closely associated with interlibrary loan. However, three major problems impede the development of networked circulation systems: transaction load, patron files, and local functions. In most libraries, the check-out and check-in transactions occur more often than any other single transaction in the library. For example, at the University of California, Berkeley, we circulate approximately one million items annually, for a total transaction load of well over two million. The cataloging load of the same library is 60,000 titles annually. Even with the possibility of more complex bibliographic searches, the cataloging process represents less than 10 percent of the workload of the circulation function. It is not at all clear to me that even a large central computer would be able to easily absorb workload increases of these proportions.

In addition, the circulation process requires a record of the borrower. Existing circulation systems for single institutions have the capability of storing on-line a library's entire patron file. This capability would impose an added burden on the storage capacity of a network system, and would undoubtedly cause problems with the privacy and freedom of information issues. Finally, local library functions such as overdue notices, recalls, and replacement bills must be accommodated by a circulation system; again, something that could be difficult to accommodate in a network.

Another area of high transaction level is the checking-in of serial issues and volumes. Many of the same problems arise as with the circulation function: the ratio of annual transactions to titles held is high; local data exist; and local practices and forms must be accommodated. For example, given an assumed average issue frequency of quarterly, a library with 10,000 active serial titles would receive 40,000 pieces to be checked in annually, or over 150 pieces daily. Local transactions are claiming, cancelling, and binding. Local data are the binding title and vendor address, among others. The bindery, claim and cancel forms are also locally oriented. (the nice thing about a catalog card, as we all know, is that it is a standard size, and before you place any marks on it, it is plain white. That is not the case with most other library forms.)

For somewhat different reasons, fiscal control is an area which should at least initially be ignored by network designers. Fiscal transactions represent a point of contact for each library with its parent organization, in which the library must usually conform to the codes, practices, and printed forms of the parent agency. It is unlikely that a network organization could convince the business officers of an institution to relinquish control of their library funds to a computer owned and operated by an independent agency. Also questionable is the feasibility of incorporating into a network system the programming necessary to manipulate unlimited formats of fund codes and other local data, at least not without a sizable investment of staff and money.

There are some other issues and problems which must be added in network development. The most difficult of these are not technical problems, but are administrative or political issues.

As I mentioned earlier, on-line network resources have not yet coped with the problem of authority control. The New York Public Library and University of Chicago Library come closer to achieving this goal than any other organization I know of; their catalogs are produced by systems which do automatic authority checking, and identify for human verification all entries which are not yet established headings. However, these are single institutions, and I think we can say that authority control must by definition be simpler there than among a variety of institutions.

Let us look at the CONSER project in comparison. The original decision was to accept only AACR entries in the CONSER data base. The repercussions of this decision in participating libraries were such that the decision was changed to allow ALA entries as well. Depending on the source of the bibliographic data, then, a single title may be entered in the file more than once, under more than one entry, making it very difficult to retrieve. The dynamics of the cataloging code plus burgeoning international standards complicate the quest for authority control. But other situations conspire to make the variant bibliographic information problems even worse. First, whenever more than one person catalogs a work, even within a single institution, there is a strong possibility that different entries and headings may be chosen; different libraries have modified the "standard" cataloging code in different ways: larger and older libraries, as you well know, are bound to have massive amounts of data which do not conform to any known standard; library authority data often do not match authority data emanating from data base producers (and this is something that is being taken now quite seriously by the data base producers themselves), or, finally, special subject areas within librarianship have adopted their own authority mechanisms because they find that the existing ones do not give them the fine distinctions that they require.

Why is this important? For instance, with OCLC or with LC's processing system, or with a number of machine-based systems, in order to retrieve a record, you must know the exact author and title, or at least the exact title, if it is not the LC call number and the ISBN. So, for the bibliographic data, you need to know how the entry has been entered into the data base. How can we share resources and data unless we share a language with which to describe our holdings? Also, authority "noncontrol" may lead to a less efficient on-line system because of the potential for large numbers of duplicate records appearing within the file. This is costly. Again, OCLC has encountered this problem and is working on a solution. No solution can be perfect, however, because administrative and machine controls can go only to a certain point; beyond that point is needed the mutual agreement of network participants to conform to specified practices to the best of their ability. This kind of mutual understanding must be communicated throughout library staffs, must be communicated down to the people who actually are working with the system, or it will not work.

More difficult than the technical or technological questions are the administrative and political ones, as you can well imagine. In OCLC, we have already seen some of the issues involved in setting a pricing algorithm for an on-line network which is governed cooperatively. OCLC members pay approximately two dollars if they use a bibliographic record already in the data base; this is called First Time Use. If they input a record originally, they pay only card costs. This was designed, in part, as an incentive to stimulate the input of non-MARC data. In some ways the technique has backfired, as libraries may enter duplicate records in order to avoid the First Time Use charge.

Related to the pricing problem is the question of data ownership and reciprocity. A network, in order to function, must provide benefits to all members. OCLC's algorithm partly answers the question important to research libraries: that is, what do we stand to gain by inputting all our records for use by other libraries? The algorithm fails chiefly with its lack of ability to control, in the same way that there is no authority control. I would like to see a network which used the following formula: each record entered or used would cost the library a specific base amount. If the library used an existing record that is, a record input by another library or from MARC, there would be a small surcharge. Conversely, each time a library used another library's record, the source library would receive a small credit. There would be net inputters, just as there are now net lenders in our interlibrary lending structure. The penalty for using an existing record would not be restrictive, and the credit for "donating" to the data base would not be excessive. Because the bibliographic data from larger libraries would be used as much for interlibrary loan as for cataloging data, the system of reimbursement might be tied to the apparently increasing trend toward charging for interlibrary loans as well as for creation of bibliographic data. This description is, to be sure, simplistic, and many details would have to be ironed out. But I think that it addresses the needs of both larger and smaller libraries, and implies a level of ownership without being unduly rigid.

The network issue of most significance now is the question of national network design and management, as well as interface with national information systems in other countries. The library profession has assumed that a heterogeneous network is desirable and possible; that is, we should aim toward a network which includes all types and sizes of libraries as well as most library functions. The network organizations which exist now do not appear to have major difficulties with conflicts between types or sizes of libraries. However, we must recognize first that most network organizations right now consist of relatively homogeneous members, either mostly academic or public libraries, larger or smaller libraries, and secondly, we have not yet developed a network resource which would actually force user libraries to face the question of changing their local practices. This is, of course, where the crunch would come. Current networks serve libraries as a tool, in whatever way the libraries wishes to operate this tool. Perhaps this is as far as network resources can or should go. We should realize that any change in perception of the role of the network resource can easily increase the level of conflict within and among network organizations. I will not discuss this area in further detail. Several people who are already deeply involved in national network design are here at this meeting to discuss their ongoing efforts with you.

Now I would like to go into some detail about a couple of technical developments which I feel are exciting and significant for library networks. First of all, we have minicomputers. Libraries are beginning to use minicomputers, especially as parts of complete hardware-software packages for various applications. The systems developed by the CLSI company are at this time the foremost examples of application packages based on minicomputers. The most recent commercial circulation packages are also minicomputer-based: these include the 3M system, Systems Control, Inc., and a prototype system based on Hewlett-Packard equipment at the Virginia Polytechnic Institute Library. Libraries are acquiring and programming minicomputers on their own. The University of Minnesota Biomedical Library, for instance, has created a sophisticated minicomputer-based processing system. In fact, minicomputers are now so prevalent and so inexpensive that in some cases it is difficult to draw the line between a "minicomputer," "data entry device," and a "word processing machine."

There are several reasons for the minicomputer entrance into what has until now been a field dominated by the large computer. First, minicomputers are economical: an expensive minicomputer will cost at the most $50,000; an inexpensive one might be $5,000 or less. Secondly, the advent of library-oriented applications packages is stimulating the marketability of the mini. Thirdly, we must look at some of the chief reasons for networking; besides resource and data sharing, they include distributed cost of software development, and shared burden of equipment costs. Minicomputers are likely to be competitive with networks in both of these areas. An important attribute of a minicomputer is its capability for telecommunication processing, enabling the transfer of data between two minicomputers, or between a minicomputer and a large-scale computer. This is where the interface of the minicomputer and the network becomes possible.

The second exciting technical development is something that I will refer to as "network normalization," although I did not invent the phrase. Network normalization means the ability to access more than one network and process data, without significant alterations in approach to the machine. In other words, with normalization, you or I could go to a computer terminal, log on, and access OCLC or BALLOTS or Lockheed or SDC without requiring a totally different set of instructions or procedures for every one of these systems. With an existing operational normalizing system, users of on-line reference data bases can formulate their searches in plain English; the program is designed to translate the queries to the particular data base being used. At a slight increase in computer cost, then, the efficiency of the human being searching the data bases is maximized.

The research being carried out in this area is by no means limited to libraries. Other organizations are experiencing similar problems with the need to communicate information from one pre-existing network data base to another. Among the groups working on the problem are the National Bureau of Standards, the Rand Corporation, Stanford Research Institute, and Battelle. In ALA the ISAD Telecommunications Committee has been concentrating on a subset of the question, that is, the standards, procedures, and protocols required to enable library networks to communicate with one another. A proposal for discussion purposes will appear in the June issue of the Journal of Library Automation. The work is very promising, although one has to wonder how we will achieve a single logical system with these disparate groups all working on solutions!

Let us review the elements discussed in the past half-hour or so; they provide the building blocks for the network of the future. We have several types of networks: processing, reference, commercial, and variations of these types. Secondly, the scope of networking should perhaps not be inclusive of every library function. Some functions have characteristics which make them more adaptable to local processing than network processing. Thirdly, certain issues require resolution before a rational networking scheme can become operational. Standards -- both bibliographic and performance -- must be identified, agreed upon, and adopted. Administrative and policy questions such as pricing, data base ownership, and general network management must be carefully studied and negotiated. Finally, hardware and software developments continue to provide expanded alternatives to the information profession. Minicomputers and network normalization are two of the important features of our future network.

Given these building blocks, we can construct a possible library network of a decade hence. There will be large computers in several regions of the country, as repositories of large bibliographic data bases, as communications concentrators and switchers for messages and queries among libraries, and as direct processing centers for libraries which do not have access to computer facilities. Ideally, these regions will be interconnected; they will be connected also to the Library of Congress and its bibliographic system, which will serve as the bibliographic backbone of the national network and the liaison with other national systems.

Minicomputers and/or terminals in libraries will either access the data as is presently done with on-line networks, or will access the data and actually move the records in machine-readable form to be processed locally, perhaps for production of local microform catalogs.

To be more precise, let me describe a scenario. Let us say that I am located in California, and have a minicomputer which has telecommunications facilities and a large disk drive. On that disk drive I keep a data base of my abbreviated shelflist records, record of volumes held, and perhaps some other locally useful information such as fund files. As I acquire and catalog materials, I use the mini to request bibliographic data from my regional data base or from another data base in the country. Having assigned a call number and location to the record, I report these back to the regional data base, which acts as a union catalog, or which may act as a union catalog. I have the option of transferring the full bibliographic record to my own catalog file, or of maintaining only the brief shelflist record and querying the large file on those occasions when I need the full bibliographic data. We need to do a little research on the rise of full bibliographic records versus an abbreviated one to determine what the optimum pattern is here. My circulation transactions and other local functions run on the same or a connected minicomputer. Locally, I can maintain my catalog on-line, in card form, or in microform, as circumstances dictate.

With this configuration of equipment, I can gradually link together the processing and reference functions. Using nationally accepted standards, which I assume will continue to evolve, my library's users will have access not only to the basic bibliographic information for the library, but also to the abstracting and indexing services which I can link to my existing data base -- an expansion of services and products. I order materials by machine-readable communications to vendors, and they in turn bill me in machine-readable form. (This is already occuring). The authority controls for linking libraries, abstracting and indexing services, and other members of the information industry will be complex and time-consuming to work out; it may not be possible or desirable to do so. Again, a system for normalizing names and titles may be the only way to assure communication between the various segments of the information community. Again, this description may be simplistic. But the equipment, the technology, and the concepts are all there and are ready to be pieced together in this massive jigsaw puzzle.

What are the implications for the individual library in all of this? In the long run, the implications of automated networks for libraries are very wide-ranging. I would like to mention just a few areas in which libraries and library staffs can cope with what appears to be the inexorable expansion of technology into our lives. Library administrators and staffs may wish to consider the potential of these concepts for their libraries. Until now, most libraries have implemented automated or network systems without radically changing the tools and methods of their staffs and patrons. The new systems have been used effectively to assist in keeping up the old manual systems. By now it is clear that true implementation of networks and other computer technology must force us to at least consider altering the traditional patterns and tools of library and bibliographic access. It is possible that the organization and use of the library can and will change fundamentally. The relationship of libraries to other segments of the information community is changing even now.

Secondly, with the advent of machine-readable data and programmable equipment, we are no longer in a position where a decision to change a procedure has to be a final decision. This concept is very difficult to communicate to librarians. They feel that a proposed procedure or new bibliographic tool must be agonized over and perfected before the first step is taken; when it is pointed out that, if they do not like the way the printout or microfiche works, they can request a change immediately, they are relieved, delighted and anxious to take advantage of these capabilities.

Thirdly, minicomputers and networks must be accepted as compatible tools, rather than being mutually exclusive. It must be made clear to governing bodies that neither one nor the other alone can provide the ultimate solution to the library problem, but that the combination is likely to be quite successful.

An automated system in a library, finally, will require comprehensive training and familiarity on the part of the library staff, whether librarian, paraprofessional, or systems analyst. This statement applies to both networks and so-called turnkey minicomputer systems, as well as to systems developed in-house. Effective use of a tool requires knowledgeable operation of that tool, as we all know, not only in library automation but everywhere we look.

In conclusion, I have a reputation among my colleagues for being quite optimistic about innovative technologies and where we are going with them. Perhaps my optimism is unjustified. Nevertheless, I ask you to recall libraries and library automation over the past 15 years. In 1960, we were not yet really using computers. In 1965, someone was just beginning to invent the MARC format. In 1970, only a little more than five years ago, Fred Kilgour's on-line system which is now in use in over 500 libraries was not yet up and running. These are remarkably short spans of time; we have accomplished a great deal and our libraries are moving to accommodate the changes. Now we must concentrate on the tasks of the next five, ten, fifteen years, and we must remember that it is not very far away.

* * * *

Discussion

MR. JACKSON: You mentioned that about 50 to 60 percent of ARL libraries subscribe to the Lockheed data base. Now that presumably is unverifiable information, and I am wondering if in fact 50 to 60 percent of the libraries are subscribers, which would mean that I have got to get off the ground. But I will take a little more comfort if, in fact, as in our institution, some other agency on the campus is the agency that is subscribing. Do you have any way of knowing what that answer might be?

SUSAN MARTIN: How many libraries have access to Lockheed and SDC for their users? [Approximately two-thirds raised their hands].

MR. SPAULDING: In terms of that question, what about those institutions where the university has access, but the library does not specifically. This is what Mr. Jackson was really getting at.

MS. MARTIN: Maybe I had better tell you how I went about doing this. I took the page which was the listing of members out of one of the ARL publications and I sent it to Lockheed and I said, "Please tell me how many of these people are your customers." I just assumed that he would understand that it was the library. That may be a faulty assumption, and he may have counted institutions as well. I can check that.

MR. GOVAN: I wonder if there is any indication at all that the for-profit systems are interested in network normalization?

MS. MARTIN: That is a very good question, and I do not really feel very competent to answer. I know that there are certain factors which are involved with the profit incentive, which get in the way of normalizing access to the networks, together with these data bases. I have not discussed it with anybody who is involved at any one of these commercial institutions, so I do not know how they feel about it. The system that I was talking about, is called ROBOT, and it is a program that was designed to provide access, at an independent institution, to a variety of these data bases.

MR. KRITZER: It is my understanding that SDC and Lockheed both are accessible through the same terminal and through the same language. I am not sure of that being so, but we believe that, and we are just getting started with Lockheed.

MS. MARTIN: Yes, that is the case. However, once you get onto either SDC or Lockheed, the person who is keying in the query must be aware of the unique qualities or characteristics of each of the data bases that is being searched. For instance, ERIC has its own thesaurus, and other data bases have their own ways of accessing the data. The network normalization techniques that I referred to are designed to do away with this so that a person can structure a question in plain English, no matter what data base it is, and get an intelligible response.

MR. KREISSMAN: Could you give us some of the rationale behind your ideal networking system, and particularly the data base element, in which the library that inputs the original catalog would get a credit back. That seems to me, on first blush, like an impractical scheme.

MS. MARTIN: Well, I gave quite a bit of thought to the business of having a library input records and not have to pay for it at all; and therefore, the probability of having libraries input almost anything and not necessarily checking to see if the record already existed in the data base, and the possible creation of duplicate records. It seemed to me if there was some credit given to the inputter, but not too much credit, that that would get across the idea that really, for example, if you are going to input records, please check for duplications because we do not want to burden the system with a tremendous amount of duplicate data, which is both uneconomical for the system, and difficult to search. Yet, there would be some kind of compensation in there, and I was thinking somewhere along the lines of perhaps $2 a record, and $2.10 for the people who use somebody else's records, and a credit of ten cents whenever one of your records was used.

MR. READY: I think that the presentation so far has shown a considerable improvement upon our situation; but I think it is naive to think that we are going to continue along this sunny road for the next five years. What we have really done is clear the ditches, prepare the field for the real battle of the philosophy of library economy. There are enormous problems being raised as a result of our being able to realize the extent of them, and there is going to be a hard time ahead, much harder than we have had in the past, where technology has given us a magic wand to clear away the cobwebs. Now we are facing real difficulties of a philosophical nature on the use of materials.

MS. MARTIN: I think you are quite right. I think that maybe these philosophical questions can be avoided if we want to, but we probably should not, and when we actually face them, there are definitely going to be difficulties.

MR. BOES: Just one editorial comment: occasionally I see confusion between processing and cataloging. The two are not necessarily synonymous.

MS. MARTIN: Right. I am aware of that.

MR. McDONALD: I was particularly interested in your comments about the necessity for common language in order to facilitate resource sharing. I am afraid my question is vague, but I am wondering in light of the fact that the ARL is deeply involved in resource sharing through traditional interlibrary loan and hopes to be involved in the new modes of resource sharing, perhaps through a national lending library of some type, whether you have any thoughts about simplifying through networking the road to resource sharing that lies ahead?

MS. MARTIN: It is also difficult. That is a tough one to answer very quickly. When you say resource sharing you are talking about materials?

MR. McDONALD: Yes. You established the importance of language between bibliographical control and resource sharing. I guess I was asking you for a little more on that particular subject.

MS. MARTIN: I think that the efforts that will be described later in this program, especially the things that are going on at the Library of Congress,and RLG, are probably going to address that question a little more specifically.

MR. BOSS: I wonder if there is not another implication of the technology for the large research library. One of the things we have encountered in dealing with patron's need for more access to machine-stored data bases, that in order to go to the terminal, one has to sit down with that patron and conduct the kind of reference interview that normally has not been conducted when approaching data that is in printed format, and I think it is beginning to cause some of our patrons to wonder why they do not get the same kind of concern about their needs when the answer is not available there at the computer terminal. I think it is going to force us to look at our whole reference program.

MS. MARTIN: That is a good point, and also reminds me of something that we were talking about at the table on financial problems, when we were talking about reallocation of resources. We will require more staff to assist patrons to become familiar with this system as they become more prevalent throughout the country. That is one place where we can use them.

MR. WELSH: We face an enormous problem at LC as automation begins to have its impact. In one division 400 people will literally be replaced by machine. What we are going to do is to retrain the staff to work in the reference department side and provide the types of reference systems for both the person using the terminal and for everyone coming in the front door. I think this is long overdue. We are going to make a joint effort to do a better job of being active with our users.

* * * *

NEW DYNAMICS OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES AND NETWORKS

Le Moyne Anderson

LE MOYNE ANDERSON: There is evidence to suggest that the modern research library appears to be threatened by its own successes. In responding to our various communities' insatiable demands for more resources, more services, and more facilities, we may be risking the fate which size and mindlessness imposed upon the dinosaur.

There are opposing indications, however, from which one can infer that the modern research library is spurred by its own failures. In addressing the needs of our clienteles we overcompensate so grossly for our inadequacies that we may be risking the fate which super power imposed upon the Six-Million Dollar Man--or as some of you may prefer, the Bionic Woman. To twist the Tale of Two Cities slightly, "it was the best of times, it was the worst of times... we had everything before us, we had nothing before us..." This bit of Dickensian eloquence in many ways epitomizes research library conditions today.

Libraries are cancelling serials subscriptions for lack of funds; yet book budgets have never been higher. Enrollments in colleges and universities are stabilizing; yet, the use of library resources has increased astronomically. At any given time, in any given library, you could accurately say that the milieu is either cool and controlled or volatile and voluble. You could as convincingly say that the research library is being threatened for its very life, or that it is having a fabulous heyday. When professional journal headlines and editorials trumpet that librarians cannot obtain jobs and that several are all but digging ditches, another story on an opposite page reports that enrollments in graduate library schools have never been higher. What are the great changes affecting the contemporary research library? What are the forces operating in libraries to bring about these changes? What can we do about resolving the problems of transferring information?

As a point of departure for this small, primitive landscape I am about to sketch, let me introduce the familiar dichotomy of a library organization; namely, the technical services and the public services. It is not news nowadays to proclaim that the acquisitions dollar is purchasing fewer items than it has in the past. We acknowledge, also, that the serials slice is consuming more and more of the acquisitions pie. The result of these situations is that the number of books obtained is decreasing; the number of microforms acquired has dropped; and the maps, the audio-visual items and the fugitive materials are falling in annual totals added. In some instances, serials are being discontinued. The new serials titles are not being acquired for the library shelves either--at least not in the great numbers of previous years.

Within the technical services arena consequently,our staffs are faced with the task of selecting and acquiring materials with more dollars which buy fewer items. These developments, in turn, also lead to the lessening in items cataloged, to fewer items physically prepared, and to the not-so- many cards reproduced for our catalogs. At the same time, it is noted that methods are being employed which have reduced the per capita commitment toward processing of materials for a research library. We are adapting the automated accounting procedures of our parent institutions. We are tapping remote machine-readable information search services. We are utilizing the output of on-line bibliographical data centers.

Meanwhile, what is occurring in the public services portion of our dichotomy? The stabilizing or sometimes decreasing/increasing enrollment in universities suggests commensurate demands for library services. This is not our experience, however. The growing user audience seems to be vastly deviate from any changes in a library's primary constituency. Circulation transactions are increasing, requests for special materials are on the rise, attendance in buildings is way up, and the spiraling ascent of interlibrary loan transactions continues unabated.

Although we have little empirical evidence, we do have some theories regarding these phenomena. It is suggested, for example, that despite the claim that entering students now lack background in the basic disciplines, their preparation in how to use libraries may not be so weak. It has also been observed that professors are making more assignments involving library resources, thereby suggesting a renewed awareness. The burgeoning reserve material we have noticed may be attributable, however, to nothing more than a way to eliminate the requirement for students to purchase their own books. There does seem to be, nonetheless, a greater cognizance among students, particularly in the science-technology areas, of the values in reviewing the literature more thoroughly and exhaustively, thereby generating a higher utilization of our holdings.

It is true that many of our circulation systems have been automated, thus providing benefits in time saving to the staff and patron alike. It is a fact that many libraries have installed electronic security systems, thus reducing the staff commitment to what some students used to call "search and seizure." There are also self-guided tour devices and self-instructional a/v equipment, thus shortening and reinforcing the learning process in how to use libraries. Despite these advantages, we still have the escalating demands which seem to outdistance our capability to respond satisfactorily.

All of these forces are leading public services staffs to cry out for reinforcements. The options of reducing hours, or limiting circulation, or diminishing the interlibrary loan programs are anathema to librarians laboring toward getting "the right book, to the right reader, at the right time," to quote a friend.

There is still another dynamic which hovers over these forces at play. It is significant that in relation to the aforementioned centers of activity, or non-activity, we have a relatively constant work force -- the total numbers of staff members are not changing appreciably. On the one hand, we have, in effect, the same number of technical services personnel with fewer items to process. On the other hand, we have the same number of public service personnel with a greater number of patrons to meet and materials to circulate.

One could readily postulate subsequently that we need fewer staff members in technical services and more persons in public services.

What is inherent in these conditions to suggest a relationship to networks? It is axiomatic that when the demands upon any service agency exceed the capabilities to respond positively, then alternatives must be developed. It seems clear that we speak now of networks because of the magnificent programs that the joining together of such a diverse array of libraries and librarians can provide. The merging of various research libraries to form a network enhances the possibilities of service to our patrons whether on the campus or in the larger communities of the state, region, and nation.

We cannot survive independently. The self-sustaining research library is moribund. In this day and age, research libraries have little choice.

WE NEED TO SHARE.

We need to share collection development responsibilities because we cannot afford to acquire separately everything desired. We need to share the resources already acquired because much of it is little-used and others should have access to it. We need to share catalog information because this will reduce duplication of effort and enable us to organize more quickly our collections. We need to share the development and use of bibliographical apparatus because it will enhance collection utilization. We need to share the facilities because we cannot continue adding new structures by ourselves to accommodate these collections. We need to share the staffs which provide the interpretive services because we need the benefit of group opinions and outside views of specialists which we cannot provide alone.

Focusing on the cost factors, we see that by joining together under one over-arching structure that it becomes possible to perform a variety of services without the cost to any one person or group becoming prohibitive. Tradeoffs occur between costs and benefits. Some libraries may pay more than it costs for their specific gains while receiving indirect benefit flowing from the enrichment of several programs in a network made possible by the presence of a broad distribution of talent and expertise. The willingness of some to pay or to receive less in support of their specific program rests on a reciprocal, but often unspoken, arrangement whereby those who pay more or receive less in monetary terms are assured that the programs most vital to them will be supported adequately.

Cooperation is really "where it's at." Sharing flows from this idea, which is essentially what networks are all about. We are really concluding, then, that an awareness of these dynamics leads naturally and logically to share through networks. Cooperation and sharing and networks and consortia and all of the other interrelated concepts and systems deserve, indeed, demand our continuing careful consideration during these critical times. We would be well served during our current dialogues if we seize upon these contemporary concerns as an opportunity -- a golden opportunity -- to rediscover Parnassus, the consecrated seat of the Muses, a place where wisdom resides and where people confused by the whirlwind of change can secure direction to find their way again.

* * * *

NETWORKS: CHANGE AGENTS, GOVERNANCE PROBLEMS, AND STANDARD COSTS

Richard De Gennaro

In the brief time I have I am going to draw on my personal experience with OCLC and PALINET at the University of Pennsylvania to discuss three aspects of network participation. First I will talk very briefly about how participation in a computerized network can serve as an effective catalyst and change agent. Then I will discuss the potential goverance problems that could develop by having a variety of library types in the same network. I will conclude with some thoughts on how networks are encouraging the general acceptance of standard costs and charges for performing certain functions and a few of the potential benefits of this trend.

OCLC as a Change Agent

At Pennsylvania we used participation in the OCLC system as a vehicle for introducing change and for creating a climate hospitable to change, not only in the technical services areas directly effected, but in other areas as well.

We joined OCLC in the Fall of 1971 and went operational with our first terminal in February, 1972. Pennsylvania, Temple, and Drexel were probably the first libraries outside Ohio to use the OCLC system. We used the Union Library Catalogue of Pennsylvania's corporate structure as the vehicle for facilitating our participation and formed a network called PALINET-ULC to interface with OCLC and to computerize the Union Library Catalogue's traditional manual operations. Pennsylvania's strategy was to assign full responsibility for implementing OCLC to the regular staff in the units that would have to use the system, rather than to assign this responsibility to the systems development group. This strategy challenged and committed the library staff to the successful implementation of the system--and it worked exceedingly well.

As we increased the number of terminals and expanded the scope of the operation to original cataloging, interlibrary loan, and serials, the requirements of implementing and operating the OCLC system generated among the staff members and heads of the various units involved a new interest in their work and a new spirt of cooperation. Units like LC Cataloging, Original Cataloging, Serials, and Interlibrary Loan, which under the manual system operated as separate units with relatively little interchange, now had to work closely with each other to learn to use the system and to share the terminals--six out of seven of which are located in the same workroom. In short, use of the OCLC system has created a common bond and shared experience and fostered a new feeling of pride, unity, and accomplishment among the technical services staff. It has increased the skills of both the nonprofessional as well as the professionals, and this has helped alleviate the concern that some staff members had about being replaced or diminished by the system. It has given the professionals a broader national perspective and made them feel part of a national movement.

The implementation of OCLC required a number of changes in the size, composition, location, and supervision of work units in technical services, and the process of making these changes created an expectation and willingness among the staff to propose and accept changes in other areas as well. Change came to be accepted almost as a matter of course and new proposals could be discussed much more openly and objectively. The staff has developed a positive and accepting attitude toward new ideas as a result of their successful do-it-yourself implementation of the OCLC system and the other developments it set in motion.

I was going to say a few more things about this but I would prefer instead to call your attention to an authoritative and comprehensive article on the subject that appeared in the May issue of American Libraries. It is by Joe Hewitt and is entitled "The Impact of OCLC." It is based on his research for a Ph.D. at the University of Colorado. In the same issue there is an excellent introductory article on the OCLC Network by Art Plotnik with a photograph of Fred Kilgour looking like Santa Claus.

Network Composition and Goverance Problems

The directors and technical services heads of the large academic libraries that initially formed PALINET made a heavy investment of time and effort in building a solid foundation and structure for the network. As other large academic libraries in the area joined, these burdens were shared. We had a policy of "each one teach one," which meant that each member library would assume responsibility for training and bringing in one or more new members. PALINET had no paid staff until January, 1975. All work on behalf of the network was contributed by the member libraries up to that time.

In 1974, PALINET made a decision to seek a grant of State Title I and Title II funds to purchase terminals for the use of some 40 small college and public libraries in Eastern Pennsylvania as an incentive to join the network. The impending entry of these libraries required a training staff, a more formal organization and governance structure with new by-laws, etc. It seemed clear that the time had come when PALINET was becoming much more important than the Union Library Catalogue and that the two organizations should be merged in such a way as to reflect this new reality. New by-laws were drafted and ratified in 1975 and the new organization was named PALINET and The Union Library Catalogue.

In an effort to assure the financial stability and continuity of PALINET, the charter members created a governance structure which is intended to place a heavier share of the burden of governance on the members who make the largest contribution and have the largest stake in the success of the network. Although the small libraries are well represented on the governing board and special committees, there continues to be some agitation for a much more democratic governance structure. Some of the new members, particularly the smaller libraries, are concerned about the way that the 13 member Board of Trustees of PALINET-ULC is elected. They object to a nominating committee appointed by the Board as provided by the by-laws and would prefer that it be elected by the entire membership. They are really asking for more direct democracy and an equal voice for each library regardless of size.

It is too early to make a judgement, but it may turn out to be undesirable, or even unworkable in the long run, for networks like PALINET, NELINET, and SOLINET to have such a large and diversified membership. Perhaps the needs and goals of large research libraries are different enough from those of small public and college libraries to warrant separate but cooperating processing utilities and resource sharing networks in the future. This is probably one of the reasons why RLG was formed. I am still somewhat skeptical about the long-term political and financial viability of large and diverse networks where the small libraries want authority to be on a one-library-one-vote basis or some similar democratic plan, while the large ones want it to be distributed proportional to financial stake. The small libraries in PALINET had an initial concern about assuming the assessments and fees that were required to support the network administrative staff and overhead, and it was only the availability of assistance that tipped the scales in favor of joining.

Up until now the network's only function has been to provide the OCLC shared cataloging and location capability to its members in the manner of a utility. As long as that is the case, the potential incompatibilities among the members may remain submerged. However, as these networks try to take on a variety of functions including resource sharing, the incompatibilities and differences in size, goals, needs, and capabilities of the various types of member libraries could begin to surface and create serious operational and governance problems in the future. But this is by no means inevitable. There is another consequence of network participation that is beginning to take on consider significance.

Acceptance of Standard Costs and Fees for Service

Networks are beginning to educate and condition their members--both large and small--to the cost of certain of the library's own operations as well as the cost of the services they get from the network and from other libraries. Rank and file librarians as well as administrators are becoming cost conscious and are being forced to attach a dollar value to the services that are bought from OCLC-PALINET, including cataloging, searching, card production, serial check-in, etc. The unit cost of OCLC services is uniform for all libraries and provides a basis for comparison with the cost of some manual operations within a particular library as well as with those of other libraries.

In addition PALINET-UCLC has recently revised its methods of charging for manual searches in its union card and microfilm catalogs. Instead of providing unlimited services in return for a fixed annual fee based on the size of a library's total budget, ULC now charges a fixed fee for each search or other unit of service performed in addition to a $200 uniform annual membership fee which entitles the member to 50 searches. The previous system distorted and masked the relationship between the dues paid and services received while the new system makes a direct correlation between fees and services. This trend toward fees-for-service could have very significant effects. For example, it could help make interlibrary charges acceptable.

If network member libraries become conditioned to paying for certain manual as well as computer-based library services, why should they balk at paying interlibrary loan fees? The acceptance of the concept of paying fees for services rendered could be very salutary and could help make truly effective networking and resource sharing possible by putting it on a realistic business-like basis. This would remove the element of charity that has always inhibited the growth and development of interlibrary loan and other forms of cooperation.

In sum, the emergence and general acceptance of standardized costs and fees for various internal and external library procedures and services as a consequence of computer-based networking could help make it possible for all kinds of libraries to coexist harmoniously in a single network. I think it will also help put interlibrary cooperation and resource sharing on a sound financial basis and thereby encourage growth and development in the future.

* * * *

Discussion

JAMES SCHMIDT: I would like to ask you to pursue a little bit the fee thing and some of its consequences. I am not an economist, but it seems to me that when you talk about fees for service, you begin to talk about marketplace models -- monopolistic models on the one hand, or economic Darwinism on the other. You can talk about fees as they are interchangeable among institutions without being applicable for users. You can talk about fees being passed through to individual library users, and then you have got another marketplace model on the campus. I think there are some distressful implications on both levels, institutional and individual, and with respect to various marketplace models that might be emerging from fees for services.

RICHARD DE GENNARO: I am a little out of my depth when it comes to economic theories. All I was trying to say in the last part of my presentation was that OCLC is creating a standard cost for performance of certain functions, such as $2.00 for a first time use of a catalog record or a set amount for a search. This is making many rank and file librarians cost conscious for the first time and giving them a standard against which they can measure the cost of doing these same operations in a manual mode. I am suggesting that the existence of these standardized fees could become a yardstick for measuring the cost of various library operations and that librarians will become accustomed to attaching a cost to an operation. I do not pretend to understand all the implications of this trend but I think I see some good practical consequences. Up to now the cost of our manual operations has always been hidden; the new computer-based services are bringing them out in the open, making cost analysis acceptable and comprehensible to librarians, and providing a yardstick for comparison.

RICHARD BOSS: I wonder why, as we try to make our fellow librarians cost conscious, why we should stop there and not go ahead and make the users more cost conscious by providing them, along with their interlibrary loan item that we obtained for them, a short statement to be effect that a $7.52 cost of acquiring this item has been borne by our library on your behalf; or putting a sign above the circulation desk, saying that that checkout that you just undertook cost the library 42.5 cents, to extend that awareness beyond just our library profession.

RICHARD DE GENNARO: I do not know what the philosophical reasons would be, but I think I know what the practical consequences would be. I think that I would much rather get the lump sum of money from the university for my budget and simply provide services without making users aware of costs. I think there is a difference between doing that and making sure that the library staff and administration are cost conscious in making the choices between doing things one way or another; but I think that the users should be spared all this kind of talk about costs and benefits and the like.

I have a recent experience at Pennsylvania where three years ago the university implemented a responsibility center accounting system in which there are two kinds of centers. There are profit centers and indirect cost centers, with the library being an indirect cost center. The consequence has been that the total library budget gets charged back to the users' budgetary units. The various graduate schools and departments get charged for their share of the use of the library that we are able to attribute to them. The effects of this system are disastrous, because it has begun to create the idea that the library is supported by taxing the various constituencies and the more they use the library, the more they are going to pay. It could begin to create an anti-library attitude. Fortunately, I am pleased to say that budget administrators at Pennsylvania have seen the folly of this system. Next year they are going to change the library from an indirect cost center to a university-wide resource center with a direct subvention from central funds.

PHILIP McNIFF: It seems to me that there is a real need for identifying different levels of institutional cooperation. Perhaps we might also want to think in terms of what elements could be perhaps supported by Federal money and state money, that would take some of the burden off our institutions and establish a joint effort in financing some of our cooperative activities.

ALPHONSE TREZZA: The problem of governance of a multi-type system is very complex. I only urge you to keep an open mind that we are working on this in a variety of ways throughout the country. There is no firm conclusion, I think, at this point. I have seen it work quite well for example, in one area where you have got multi-sites and multi-types, such as in the Pittsburgh area. I urge you to take these papers as input to our thinking, rather than letting it freeze your gut feelings; because I am afraid, as was just pointed out, the mixture of funds, which is esentially local and state, is also going to have some influence on what happens to governance.

RICHARD DE GENNARO: Thank you for making that comment. As a matter of fact, what I have trying to do here is just point out some trends, and comment on them. I am not at all sure that serious network governance problems will materialize, but I think it is worthwhile at this point to recognize that there are some in the making. Most of us have been ignoring these potential problems that might come from having large research libraries and small public and college libraries in the same network, and maybe we ought to get it out in the open and talk about it. It was in the spirit I made my comments.

* * * *

EFFECT OF NETWORKS ON RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Frederick G. Kilgour
Ohio College Library Center

Let me first point out to you that studies done of the use of academic libraries in the United Kingdom and the United States show, to use the British phrase, that the libraries are in failure, and they fail between 50 and 60 percent of the time when a user comes to the library to get information. This failure rate is not an adequate response to users. The problem is, of course, that as price or cost to the user goes up, demand goes down. I am sure each of you knows of scholars that have given up using large libraries, even given up some research projects, because of the effort required to do certain types of research as libraries have increased in size and as the difficulty of using libraries has increased. You do not know of anybody? You are looking at one, because I have given up the type of research that I used to do in history because there are just too many other interesting questions that are easier to answer.

So, as the price to the user goes up, demand is going to go down. There is going to be less demand on libraries and surely a greater failure rate. Now, there have been some interesting studies made of this situation using various models. Raymond Jackson, using an erosion model, in an article in Land Economics came to the conclusion that the only way to keep from eroding libraries is to limit the number of users, an accurate but not useful finding.

Some 40 years ago when I was charging out books at the Harvard College Library, I was also looking into utilization of the library. For about 15 or 20 years following the second World War, there was a curious correlation revealing that the fewer the number of borrowers registered to use the Harvard College Library, the greater the number of books circulated. One would ordinarily think that the finding would be the other way around, that is, the more people using the library, the more books would circulate. So, we do have evidence, both of a theoretical and empirical nature, that libraries can not and do not respond successfully to increasing demands.

Librarians have thought little about the economics of libraries. I know of only five publications on the subject, and without a particle of doubt the major one is Economics of Academic Libraries by W. J. Baumol and M. Marcus. You will remember that the major problem that Baumol and Marcus pointed out was that in the two decades following 1950 the rate of rise of per-unit costs in academic libraries was seven times that of the wholesale price index; it was 6.3 percent in academic libraries, and .9 percent for the index. This is the kind of rocketing rise that is proving to be impossible to keep up with. It is not absolutely impossible, for the money is available in the economy. But from the social point of view, it is impossible, for society is not increasing support for libraries at the same rate as library costs increase.

It you calculate what is going to happen to the per-unit cost of service to the user for the next 25 years using the Baumol and Marcus data, it turns out that the cost is going to go up 460 percent. A recent study by D.K.

Halstead entitled Higher Education Prices and Price Indexes published by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare shows clearly the exacerbating efforts of inflation on the availability of funds for libraries. The most rapidly rising cost in academic institutions as a whole is fringe benefits; the next is cost of books and periodicals; and the third is salaries. The first and third costs stem from the labor intensiveness that you people discussed at your financial roundtable last night, and the only way to reduce this labor intensiveness in libraries, or to solve the problem, is to increase the productivity of library staff.

So, with library costs going up at an annual rate of 6.3 percent and with computer costs going down at the rate of 55 percent a year, it would appear desirable to invoke computer technology and thereby reverse the rate of rise of library costs by increasing productivity of staff. The major conclusion of Baumol and Marcus was that there is going to be some profound modification in the manner in which libraries are run, and that this profound modification may virtually be inevitable. Computerization could effect such a modification.

Baumol and Marcus also pointed out that libraries follow the cost trends of service institutions, of hospitals, of higher education, and of restaurants. All of these organizations have the same kind of cost trends. The rise in costs is not a problem of inefficiency in libraries, nor is it a problem of poor management which is suggested as being the villain from time to time. It is the type of economic institution that a library is that causes its plight.

If you continue to seek traditional answers, you are not going to get an answer. I would, however, accept such a traditional assumption that research libraries are not going to change a great deal in the future. I should point out to you, as I think I did once before, that this is only an assumption. It is not difficult for me to imagine a somewhat smaller group than this one meeting a century ago and called the Association of Research Museums. As you know, natural history museums no longer have the function they had in the last century, the reason being that the type of work that the natural history museums did was a qualitative biology using large collections of material. When biological research switched to quantitative biology, these museums no longer had their former importance. There has been less and less research using their large collections of material. It is not impossible that there will be a quantitative history, and even today there are historical techniques that make it unnecessary to have large collections in research libraries.

The nontraditional procedures are, of course, labor-saving techniques, and the computer can make available at least a half-dozen labor-saving principles either in a network or in an individual library system. Operating in a network, a computer can also provide economies of scale that you cannot possibly experience in an individual library, whether or not you have computation. Here you have a major opportunity to reduce the rate of rise of per-unit costs, or to put it the other way around, to increase the productivity of staff. If you use BALLOTS, OCLC, or WLN in an effective way, you can increase productivity of staff.

This new technology makes it possible to have new products and to have new objectives. The important aspect of computerized networks is the potential for new objectives and for new economic solutions to old problems. The objectives, as you know, of OCLC are to increase library resources available to individuals at participating libraries, and to reduce the rate of rise of per-unit library costs; these objectives are not attainable in classical libraries using manual techniques.

New products should be for users, and the principal new product that I am going to talk about is the on-line catalog. On-line catalogs are drastically different in design from card catalogs and from printed bookform catalogs. On-line catalogs are not on-line card catalogs. As many of you have heard me say, the OCLC on-line catalog consists of a hugh number - over a million and a half - of miniature catalogs, none of which is larger than 32 entries when presented to a user. This is a new kind of product. It is a kind of catalog that is far easier for users to use. OCLC has had some experience with users at public service terminals. In a small study of such use, more than four-fifths of the users preferred the terminal to the card catalog.

If you search library literature for a book or article on catalog design, you won't find it, except for historical discussions, unless you search more extensively than I have. Such a publication is certainly not readily available. There is much on cataloging, but nothing on understanding of the relationship of design of a catalog to cost of cataloging or to cataloging rules. The time has come, certainly, with the advent of the on-line catalog made possible by computerized networks, to design small catalogs, to design them for users, and to construct cataloging rules for such small catalogs. Some professional organization should undertake this design task and hopefully it should be undertaken in the immediate future. These new cataloging rules should not be based on bibliographic principles that began to come into being with Conrad Gesner and Andrew Maunsell in the last half of the sixteenth century; rather, the new rules should be based on the way people use catalogs and what they need to have in catalogs.

I conclude by saying that the major effects of computerized networks on academic libraries will be that networks are going to make it possible to effect drastic changes in the manner of library operations, to increase productivity of staff, and at the same time to increase availability of information to library users. I would like to suggest that ARL undertake a project to work on the design of on-line catalogs and rules for such catalogs. Somebody is going to have to do it; there certainly does not seem to be another Cutter on the horizon. This is a project that is now quite clearly delineated, and I encourage you to undertake it. If you do, you will make a major contribution to librarianship.

* * * *

INTERLIBRARY COOPERATION AND A NATIONAL ACCESS SYSTEM

Stanley McElderry

This program is concerned with a variety of topics relating to library networks. You have heard about trends in library networks, the necessity for this type of library cooperation, and the impact of networking on research libraries. This paper focuses on the national bibliographic access system and is related to the program presented at our fall meeting on "The Library of Congress as the National Bibliographic Center." The primary question under consideration is: if the Library of Congress assumes responsibility for the creation of a comprehensive national bibliographic data base in machine-readable form, what are the implications of this utility on research libraries, such as those represented here, and the emerging networks of libraries? It is clear that no one has sufficient information to answer this question. However, there are compelling reasons to attempt to answer this question. I would like to speculate with you about how such a data base would be generated, how it would be accessed, what dependable access to comprehensive bibliographic information might mean to a local library, and what areas for cooperative endeavor remain for multi-library systems. It is hoped that these observations may provoke a fruitful dialogue and lead to continued exploration and investigation.

Generation of the National Bibliographic Data

The position of the Library of Congress was stated by Mr. Welsh at our last meeting in these terms:

> The Library's role will be to develop and maintain standard bibliographic devices that will promote consistency in decentralized input to a comprehensive national data base. Decentralized input is a requirement for a national system because the Library of Congress recognizes that it cannot supply 100 percent of the cataloging information that is required nationally. Inevitably, the Library will fall short of total coverage because it will never acquire some bibliographic items; for example, many state and local documents, the output of minor publishers, and various publications in specialized fields.

Mr. Welsh went on to indicate that the Library of Congress would provide the following services and products in fulfilling this role: authority information for names, subjects, and classification. MARC coverage would be expanded to include all current cataloging by 1979. Bibliographic information and authority information would be provided in printed, microform, and machine-readable formats to meet the requirements of libraries of all types and sizes.

One may assume that the intent is to make the national bibliographic data base as comprehensive as possible at least for current acquisitions. A role for regional networks is seen as "secondary distributors of L.C. bibliographic data on-line." It is not clear, however, what the strategy would be to build a comprehensive data base for sources external to L.C. Would the networks be the route for accumulating unique records or would there be designated libraries responsible for inputting specific kinds of records? How would such input be monitored and edited to conform to L.C. authority and quality? What information from L.C. is needed, in what form, and how promptly to support decentralized input? Would the transmission of data to and from L.C. be on-line or by machine-readable tapes as at present? Would L.C. maintain a comprehensive file of national resources on-line or would it coordinate its files with other organizations?

It seems clear that the strategy for transmitting bibliographic data in its varied formats is far simpler than the strategy for accumulating authoritative input. Are existing library networks necessarily the best mechanism for disseminating and accumulating bibliographic information?

The problems of maintaining records in a bibliographic data base appear to be more than the creation and accumulation of records. What functions beyond making bibliographic information available are planned? Will holdings information be recorded nationally, or nationally and regionally? Are subsets of data to be available in printed or microform to serve as a full catalog for types of libraries? Will the national bibliographic data base be one giant files with several copies in various locations or a series of interconnected files with some unique and some redundant records? Will all records be maintained on-line or only the most recent or the records of a particular region or group of libraries?

There are obviously many details to be worked out before we can define the content, form and utility of a national bibliographic data base. It seems evident that the Library of Congress is the logical source to assume the leadership role and we applaud its efforts. We would also hope that L.C. would assume the research and development functions to support the components of a national system.

Access to the National Bibliographic Data Base

Some of the questions relationg to access to the national bibliographic data base are implicit in the previous remarks. The content of the national record is designed to support multiple functions, but there are clear limits to the number and type of demands which can be met on-line even with multiple data bases. A variety of off-line products are planned to serve special needs, and these will reduce the amount of "on-lineness" which is required. Some of the kinds of questions which arise in relation to access are: who can access the national bibliographic data base or bases on-line? Only networks? Only major libraries? What functions will be supported: bibliographic verification, collating information, copying, modifying, augmenting the record? Will access to on-line data bases be primarily for generation of local records? What kinds of access keys will be provided? What will the cost of on-line access be? Will L.C. support alternative use of the national bibliographic data base through off-line access if on-line access is limited to creation of record functions?

Bibliographic Access and the Local Library

It may be assumed that the local library (a term used to designate a library providing direct service to a defined clientel) will continue to acquire the resources most needed to meet local responsibilities and will need records to support local access. (The scope of resources held locally may well be reduced as dependable external sources and locating and delivery mechanisms are developed). The local access records would need to contain holdings information to the piece level at minimum as well as physical location. It is conceivable that functions such as verification and collocating requiring full bibliographic records could be shared with other libraries and alternative forms of access would be acceptable (i.e., book, fiche, card, on-line). Similarly some acquisition, serial, and circulation functions could be supported with considerably less than a full bibliographic record held locally if dependable access was available to more complete records as required. It is important in national planning to recognize the need of local libraries for simple readily available record identification mechanisms to reduce the dependence on locally generated bibliographic records. Further requirements of a local library are the ability to generate records in-house or through a service bureau with various options on the content and format of records (i.e., on-line, off-line products, full or partial records). The local library must also be able to log on holdings easily if such data are not captured through a service bureau, and it must be able to acquire performance data for planning purposes.

The local library would appear to have several options for acquiring necessary records for its operation. Records could be generated in-house with local equipment if dependable access was available to comprehensive bibliographic records. If access to machine readable bibliographic data is readily available, preferably on-line, prepackaged hardware, software systems operating on a mini-computer might be used to advantage in libraries having a relatively high volume of transactions. Otherwise a service bureau may provide records on demand in a variety of formats for in-house use if such processing is not performed locally.

Although the local library may have a variety of options for securing local records it will be dependent upon external bibliographic resources for extending the limits of local holdings. On-line searching also provides a dimension and flexibility in searching not available with conventional tools.

Areas for Cooperative Endeavor

The foregoing description of possible modes of operation for libraries at the national and local levels indicates considerable opportunities for more effective sharing of costs in acquiring and processing resources. Since the volume of communications and quantity of information to be exchanged between libraries is very large, it is evident that some interfacing mechanisms are required. A variety of intralibrary organizations have arisen to meet these needs. Such organizations are sometimes called consortia or networks and generally have a geographic dimension. Functions performed vary from facilitating access to resources through direct access agreements, interlibrary loan compacts and delivery systems with or without holdings information, service bureau services for record and processing information, brokerage for collection and dissemination of bibliographic information, a communication route or switching point, and related activities. For purposes of discussion here our definition of a network is limited to electronic transmission and storage of bibliographic information as a part of a national system. In this context, and with the objective of developing an economical and responsive mechanism, there are a number of questions which require resolution. Some example are:

1. What functions which fall between the national and local level are required to support a national information system? (e.g., what function remains if a national data base is supporting a local mini-computer system?)

2. Which of the following kinds of services are desirable and what are the appropriate geographic or political boundaries? Are such boundaries identical for each function?

   °coordination of collection development
   °maintenance of holdings information
   °maintenance of bibliographic records (i.e., copy of national record or subset)
   °communication route for members within network, and between network and national sources
   °responsibility for interlibrary loan transactions beyond supplying holdings information
   °responsibility for generation, maintaining, or disseminating bibliographic records
   °responsibility for quality control of bibliographic data

3. What are the factors which determine the appropriate, necessary combination of functions for a viable network?

   °which functions are subject to economics of scale?
   °what hardware configuration is required to support bibliographically related functions and what is the optimum load?
   °what is the relationship between high volume for a limited number of functions and lower volume for a wider range of functions?

4. How valid are the following constraints on the size and configuration of a network?

°political boundaries
°funding routes
°hardware and software capacity versus cost
°size, quality, availability of network staff
°telecommunication costs
°storage capacity and cost versus telecommunications costs
°efficient governance, decision making mechanism
°complexity of functions versus intercommunication requirements for consultation, decision making, education

5. What are the opportunities to structure records and access to records? What is the optimum cost/benefit configuration?

   °hierarchy by frequency of use
   °hierarchy by functions supported
   °alternative formats, access methods

6. How valid is community of interest (e.g., type of library) versus geographic boundaries as a basis for cooperative arrangements? (e.g., closeness of cooperation versus support of limited functions)

7. What trends and technological changes may be anticipated in the next 5 to 10 years and what implication do these have on inter-library dependence?

Summary and General Conclusions

The intent of this paper was to speculate about issues relating to the generation of a comprehensive national bibliographic data base, the modes of access to this data base, the impact of this utility on local library operations, and the areas for intralibrary cooperation. There are obviously more questions than answers at this point. Some general conclusions which may be started are:

1. The assumption of responsibility for generation and maintenance of a comprehensive national bibliographic data base by the Library of Congress will profoundly affect the internal operation of libraries and the degree of interdependence among them. Or to state this point in another way, the kinds and amount of cooperation between libraries is strongly influenced by the kinds and amount of bibliographic support received from the national level (i.e., it is unlikely that local and regional developments have a similar impact on national developments).

2. The opportunity for a local library to alter its collection habits and operating practices is dependent upon the kinds of access provided to the national bibliographic data base.

3. The local library will have a variety of options for internal processing depending upon the scope, content and format of the records which can be accessed. (Local data processing requirements are generally greater and more unique than is generally appreciated).

4. There is need for intralibrary mechanisms to ensure full access to bibliographic information and informational resources, but the optimum allocation of responsibilities is not known (i.e., present boundaries and combinations of services may not be the most cost effective approach in all cases).

This paper has only begun to scratch the surface of some of the issues which must be faced in planning a comprehensive national bibliographic data base. It is hoped that this effort will lead to more intensive discussion and eventual resolution of these issues.

* * * *

Discussion

MR. DOUGHERTY: I wondered if Mr. Kilgour would comment on the following characteristics -- do they apply to libraries or don't they: labor intensiveness; rising labor costs; reasonably stable productivity; decline of the quality of library services; increased demand for services.

MR. KILGOUR: The third one is not so.

MR. DOUGHERTY: I thought you had made the comment that basically, the productivity of our staff is reasonably stable?

MR. KILGOUR: Yes, if the staff are stable, the productivity is stable.

MR. DOUGHERTY: Has the profession, by and large, been slow to respond to new technology?

MR. KILGOUR: Susan Martin pointed out that there has been a remarkably rapid response, but there has not been the technology to which to respond.

MR. JACKSON: I want to point out that this technology did not exist 25 years ago. It is relatively recent, and I think there has been an extremely rapid response to it. The reason that I mention it is that if I were to agree to those points, I am also describing the problems which beset the U.S. Postal Service. We might be able to learn some lessons from their plight.

MR. KILGOUR: Well, the labor intensiveness of the Postal Service is about 85 percent -- about 85 percent of their budget is salary and wages. For research libraries, it is 55 to 60 percent.

MR. JACKSON: It is higher than that now. It already is somewhere between 75 and 80, I believe.

MR. KILGOUR: Well, there is much to do. Yes, you are quite right. Of course, there are other aspects of the Postal Service. The Postal Service has got a monopoly on first class mail, for instance, and there is a deterrent to using a technology. I hope that we never have a monopoly of on-line operations in the United States.

MR. JACKSON: That was my next point, namely that we begin to see cracks in the U.S. Postal Service's monopoly and that is going to exacerbate the situation. Libraries and other agencies are beginning to turn to alternative sources of delivery. What I am trying to do is reinforce some of the points you made, and maybe we can learn something from someone else's dilemma.

MR. KILGOUR: Last week the chief of our computer facility division called me and said, "I am looking right down a gun barrel at a strike at UPS." It happened, and we are back with the U.S. Postal Service. Let me go on to say that my current feeling is that as far as networks like OCLC are concerned in the United States, there has got to be a minimum of three and maybe more like OCLC in order to have competition. It ought to be an open martketplace economy, and there should be competition and there should be cooperation and there should be security; and it would be much too expensive to maintain the security, the additional redundancy necessary to cover, let us say, if there were only two. Each one would have to have twice as much equipment as it would have to have. There are a variety of problems, but I certainly agree with you about the Postal Service: not only in its labor intensiveness, but in its unattractive results of its monopolistic situation.

One more observation: you raised the matter of fees, whether or not a person is philosophically in favor of it or opposed. I think we have probably unleashed a change of events, the consequences of which we do not fully understand yet. I think it would be wise for ARL to establish a mechanism to monitor and to see what the impacts are. I think there are going to be some real surprises, and I think it is important for us to keep an eye on this.

MR. DE GENNARO: Are you speaking about interlibrary loan fees or fees in general?

MR. KILGOUR: That is the beginning, but I think it is spreading into other areas.

MR. DE GENNARO: That is a good observation. We have an interlibrary loan committee: It is going to get active again in this area, as you will hear at the business meeting this afternoon.

MR. SCHMIDT: Well, as long as I opened up the marketplace model economic issue earlier, I guess Mr. Dougherty has really given me a kick in the head with the analogy of the Postal Service. It strikes me, however, that there are other potentially profound consequences of various kinds of marketplace models that are of concern to me. For example, if the marketplace model is a competitive marketplace (I do not think that there are those kinds of marketplaces in any nineteenth century sense of that phrase)--can we afford to have something prove out to be the Studebaker or the Edsel of the marketplace?

Now, mentioned in purely economic terms, the answer probably is yes. But in terms of responsibility for the preservation of the intellectual resources for the nation and recorded thoughts of mankind and all of the rest of those kinds of things, it is quite a different question, it seems to me. It is profoundly depressing to me that something that might represent the bibliographic access to x number of items should be potentially the Studebaker or the Edsel. On the other hand, it seems to me that we are not wise in agreeing, nor are we willing to agree to a monopolistic model.

MR. KILGOUR: Ray Frantz and I were talking on the way from the airport a couple of days ago about goverance of the networks and he was mentioning the problems in solving that.

MR. FRANTZ: SOLINET has about 120 members now, and I remember the first meeting that we had. I guess about 95 people showed up. I will never forget the first question. Someone stood up from a library and said every library ought to have an equal vote. But that was not considered for long, and that sort of thing has not arisen again. I think that Mr. De Gennaro hit it on the point: we are getting such cost effective service, many of us, that we are concentrating on this. But I think it is going to arise again because a variety of services are wanted. It seems to me that it comes down to a difference of interpretation of libraries and the way these operations pay for service, and that we will be embarking upon a business enterprise. I do not see how you can have total democracy as a business enterprise. You could have a meeting at which every board of directors is suddenly overturned. You could have a complete lack of continuity in the board and play revolving chairs, when a very great continuity is needed. So the only thing I have come out with is to appeal to the membership to realize the diversity and to realize it is not a game. We must put the interests of the diversity first and learn from management the best way to proceed. I do not know if an educational process can cure it, but I think something has to be done before we can react to a crisis that suddenly surprises everybody at an open meeting. I worry about this very much.

MR. KRITZER: OCLC was started by a group of small and large colleges getting together and deciding what they felt was needed. OCLC is governed in a democratic fashion by the same group. It is now expanded to include large and small public libraries, so there is a diversity in sizes and a diversity in type of libraries. As far as I can tell, it still seems to be working well without the kind of problems that Mr. Frantz has brought up, so it is not necessary that there be these kinds of problem.

MR. DE GENNARO: One thought that I had with regard to a point that Mr. Kilgour made about the desirability of having some competition in this area -- let us say three networks: if we did that, it seems to me to imply that the individual libraries would have the freedom to move from one network to the other, taking advantage of the lower costs and other things. If this were the case, it seems to me to go against the concept of networks that we are now building, where there is a kind of loyalty in the membership. You have your members and they belong to you, but if the prices at BALLOTS got significantly lower than at at OCLC, can we afford to have the members of our network suddenly shifting over and changing vendors, so to speak?

MR. KILGOUR: I think the answer is yes, we can afford to have that happen. There are, however, some situations in which you can have competition that really is not perhaps fair competition; and we have a situation arising right now in the case of BALLOTS in this regard. There are a couple of problems here, but what is going on is that at OCLC and BALLOTS, at BALLOTS' suggestion, we are working out a way in which the users of each of the data bases can use the other's data base. In the event it is not in the OCLC data base, the OCLC participant can query the BALLOTS'data base and vice versa.

There are a couple of major problems and I will admit to one. One of the problems here, obviously, is BALLOTS' data base is something like 600,000 entrie and the OCLC data base is one of 2,100,000. Every study that has been done except one by Ryburn Ross, shows that the percentage of usable records in the OCLC data base is higher than the BALLOTS'data base, and there is the danger of the BALLOTS'users migrating to OCLC. This can be avoided, I am quite sure, by the manner in which charges will be done and the way it will be set up, so you can have the cooperation and still not subject one of the members who is cooperating because of an accidental situation, to the liability of losing its participants. There are other problems, but that is one.

MR. PINGS: At the moment, I am acting director of MIDLNET, the consortium in Michigan. My observation is that it is the governance aspect that is the difficult one, from where I sit. Generally, it has been accepted, intellectually, that the computer-sensitive record is here and we have got to use it. It is when you move over into starting to use it that people get threatened. Now that threat can arise almost anywhere and at any time. It can be a union; it can be a director of a library; it can be a library that has been going on for a long time and all of a sudden with the changing about, people say, "we are not governed right. You did not tell us this. We could not anticipate this."

I think those are healthy kinds of things to happen to us. Now, if you are going to be threatened, then, you see, you conserve. Now, the kind of thing I thought you were saying is, it can always be used as the excitement of being innovative and doing other things. Now, which posture are you going to take? It is pretty hard when you are threatened or the union is threatened or the head of technical services is threatened, to have an even keel. You have to blame somebody. This is just being meant in a different way, but I think what we have not recognized is that we are talking to each other, that is, the whole library community; and we are going to have to talk to each other in different ways. We are going to have to hear each other differently. I think that is part of the excitement of living in the era that we are now living in. So, we are going to be improving ourselves in new and different ways.

MR. BOES: It is obvious that at some future time we ought to have a program on the effect of what we have been discussing and what Mr. Ping's talking about -- management in libraries. I think we ought to have a program so we will begin to articulate the fact that what we have to do in our shops is going to be affecting our staffs, does affect the hiring rate of librarians, and it does affect switching them around.

MR. BOWMAN: We ought to go back to what Mr. Kilgour said at the beginning, that network libraries are not for librarians, they are for users.

* * * *

THE RESEARCH LIBRARIES GROUP

James Skipper
Research Libraries Group

Five or six years ago I addressed the Association of Research Libraries on the then-new subject of a possible economic depression in higher education. Following two decades of unprecedented expansion, libraries were at that time experiencing the first evidence of losses in purchasing power. The dimension and persistence of the impending recession were not clearly visible, and I suggested that only time would reveal whether libraries might only have to trim their financial sails, or perhaps redesign the entire ship.

More recently, after reflecting on the present and probable future of institutional abilities to maintain services, the directors of the libraries which founded RLG (Columbia, Harvard, Yale and the Research Libraries of the New York Public Library) were convinced that an increasing gulf was being created between reader needs and the ability of their libraries to satisfy the expectations of constituents. The aggregate resources of these libraries numbering some 27.5 million volumes, 247,000 current serial subscriptions, and operating budgets of approximately $45,000,000 were judged to be insufficient for meeting present needs, and future prospects were uncertain, at best. There were doubts that we would again experience the doubling of staff and a tripling of budgets which were characteristic of the 1960s.

While it is true that financial pressure was partly responsible for the establishment of the Research Libraries Group, the concepts underlying RLG are rooted in more permanent and fundamental principles than simple economic adversity. The aspirations of RLG go beyond the development of supplemental programs for improving existing bibliographic and physical access in individual libraries; they are founded on new perceptions of the ways in which libraries can organize their efforts as a consortium to improve services while reducing the rate of increase in operating budgets. This exercise is somewhat related to what has been called the dynamics of the potted plant, or how to maintain health and vigor under conditions of limited growth.

Planning for RLG was brought into focus through a report written by Joseph Rosenthal of Berkeley. Developmental activity was made possible by general support grants from the Mellon and Sloan foundations, supplemented by membership dues and uncounted hours of contributed staff time from each member. An Executive Director (now President) was appointed in August, 1974, and the RLG office, originally occupying space provided by Columbia University, moved to Branford, Connecticut in April, 1975, where The Research Libraries Group was incorporated as a not-for-profit corporation in December, 1975. Present staff consists of three positions in the Bibliographic Center at the Yale Library and four in the executive office, including a Vice-President for Systems and a Senior Systems Analyst. The Group is governed by a Board of Directors made up of three appointed representatives from each member institution, and the President, who also serves as Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board.

RLG deliberately limited membership during its formative years, not in an attempt to be exclusive, but in response to the fact that difficulties in achieving common policies and objectives among old and complex institutions increase exponentially with each additional member. The Research Libraries Group is committed to expanding membership at the appropriate time and is considering the possibility of providing services to other libraries on a fee basis.

RLG has attempted to identify a limited number of programs which have the potential for making a major impact in improving services to our users and which can be sustained on a cost-effective basis by membership support. We acknowledge that in some areas it will be difficult to obtain measurements of benefit with any degree of precision. External funding will be sought for planning and developmental work, but RLG program must be of sufficient value to members to justify their paying for operational costs.

One obvious program opportunity is the improvement of access to the collective pool of materials found in member libraries. A set of policy statements has been drafted by a committee and adopted by RLG which assures reciprocity of access to RLG collections for qualified users from any member institution. Modes of access include interlibrary loan, photocopy, and on-site visits. Unlike many interlibrary loan programs, service to undergraduate students is an integral part of the RLG system. As an example of commitment by RLG members toward expanding collections, in October, 1974 the Trustees of the New York Public Library made a historic decision in allowing books to circulate outside the Research Libraries to users in other RLG libraries.

The operation of the Shared Access Program is the responsibility of the RLG Bibliographic Center, located in space provided by the Yale University Library. The Center manages a TWX and United Parcel Service communications network which assures speedy and reliable transmission of interlibrary requests and responses among members. The performance of the system is continually monitored for delays in response time, and we are accumulating data concerning the characteristics of borrowers and the materials they request, as well as the nature of materials which cannot be found within RLG. Our members continued to act as a national resource for other libraries, lending a total of 127,000 items in 1974-75, while borrowing 12,700.

Related to the intent to share the collective bibliographic wealth of RLG collections is the requirement that we protect and preserve these resources for the benefit of future generations. The problem of deteriorating paper, while not so noticeable in newer libraries, is a special difficulty for those collections which have been developed over longer periods of time. An RLG committee is presently drafting recommendations for our preservation program. With microfilming technology being the best presently available method for preserving text, RLG has budgeted $100,000 for each of the next two years for this purpose. We have also asked the Library of Congress to discuss the possibility of RLG's depositing its present inventory of some 100,000 reels of master negatives at LC, thus making them more accessible on the national level.

Strong research libraries tend to be a confederation of strong special collections, and ways must be found to assure the continuance of adequate financial support for these national resources. In a time of seriously restricted purchasing power for acquisitions, the reduction in the amount of unnecessary duplication among RLG members is seen as one of the best ways to assure that the quality of the special collections in these libraries might be maintained. This effort constitutes the second major RLG program. We have established a system for reviewing new serial subscriptions to determine if one library might take responsibility for obtaining and maintaining the title in the interest of the other members. A similar program has been developed for coordinating the cancellation of existing subscriptions to assure that no unique title of scholarly interest will become unavailable to readers, and items costing more than $200 are reviewed by our Collection Development Committee in an effort to identify one institution which might acquire in the interest of others.

Central to RLG interests is the application of computer technology to a wide range of bibliographic operations. As even the wealthiest of our libraries finds it impossible to justify the expense of creating a comprehensive computer-based bibliographic processing system for its own use, RLG is committed to developing a single system to serve the needs of present and future members.

The requirements of the system has been specified by an RLG committee in a document recommending a broad range of products and services. Conceptually, the system is based on the creation of a union catalog controlled by a single authority file for titles added to the collections of member libraries, and is not limited to a catalog card production service which responds to the cataloging practices of individual libraries.

The creation of an integrated system requires the adaption of uniform cataloging standards among RLG libraries, and it has been agreed that this standard should be based on the Anglo-American Cataloging Rules - North American Text, as practiced by the Library of Congress. While most of our members follow the Library of Congress either entirely or with minor exceptions, RLG is conducting a survey to identify variant cataloging practices which need to be modified. As another example of membership support of RLG objectives, the Harvard College Library has announced that it will adopt Library of Congress cataloging practices in the summer of 1976.

Not only will the use of uniform cataloging practices facilitate bibliographic access among RLG libraries, but also it has the potential of making it possible for members to contribute regularly to a national data base many thousands of titles cataloged by RLG members which will not be acquired and cataloged by the Library of Congress. To further this objective, our eventual goal is to share a common computer-based authority file with the Library of Congress and other library networks.

It is RLG policy to develop and expand its bibliographic processing system, so far as possible, by borrowing and adapting computer programs which might be acquired from other existing systems. As an example, the software package for the Yale acquisition system is being modified to process and monitor activities in the RLG serials review program. Our union list of serials will be produced by a system now installed at the Harvard College Library but originally acquired from Berkeley in exchange for the book catalog program from the New York Public Library.

Of immediate interest to our mechanization objectives is a cooperative development program between RLG and the Library of Congress. Under Phase I of this program, we will test the economics and feasibility of providing library networks with direct, on-line access to machine-readable bibliographic records at LC. Utilizing programs and systems now established at LC, NYPL, and Columbia, the project will establish a data base of records reflecting titles added to RLG collections. Title searches not satisfied by the RLG file will be switched to LC and, if found, the record will be transferred back to the RLG data base. This cooperative project between RLG and the Library of Congress is viewed as the first step toward the establishment of a more comprehensive bibliographic processing system to serve the needs of present and future members of RLG.

If the eighteen month Phase I program is successful, funding will be sought to support Phases II and III, which involve the design and installation of equipment for a sophisticated system to facilitate library network-to-network communications. Files at the Library of Congress as well as bibliographic data bases at other library network centers can be searched once standards for message switching and line protocol have been set by the library community. The Library of Congress will need this capability to handle the demand created by the anticipated National Bibliographic Service. Such a telecommunications system will also make it possible for other networks to contribute cataloging information to the LC data base; i.e. through bi-directional data exchange. It is anticipated that other library organizations will participate with RLG and LC in the design of the system.

In establishing the Research Libraries Group as an alternative to attempted local self-sufficiency, it is natural that there should be many policy and procedural problems which must be adjudicated. However, the real challenge and the ultimate objective of RLG, is to alter the attitudes of library staff, faculties and students concerning library service. Historically, these perceptions have reflected a parochial view, with a focus largely limited to meeting reader needs from local collections. RLG presents the opportunity for a balance in library service objectives by emphasizing the availability of information regardless of the source.

RLG is acutely aware of its responsibilities for developing programs which are in harmony with national plans and standards. We are convinced that our objectives are consonant with recommendations of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science concerning network activities, as well as with the objectives noted by the Library of Congress in its proposal for a National Bibliographic Service. However, realizing that in some areas we must move forward in the absence of national planning, it is our intention that RLG's efforts must have the capability of interacting with, and contributing to, emerging standards on the national level.

* * * *

RLG-LC CONNECTION

William Welsh
Deputy Librarian of Congress

I am going to call this the U.S. Connection. The Research Libraries Group (RLG) and the Library of Congress (LC) are jointly involved in a project of great promise. The project can be described as a three-phase effort However, the funds for the project, which were successfully sought by the RLG for both RLC and LC, cover only Phase I. Phase I may be briefly summarized as a pilot project whereby a communications link will be installed between the RLG computer at the New York Public Library (NYPL) and the LC computer to allow the RLG members to access and acquire LC machine-readable bibliographic records. The grant funds will be used for personnel and equipment where needed for both RLG and LC, as well as for the cost to access the LC data base and for report preparation and publication. The life of the pilot, both development and operation, is for a period of 18 months.

The pilot project will begin with two of the four RLG members, NYPL and Columbia University Libraries. These institutions will be joined by Harvard and Yale if project experience indicates that the services are beneficial. The RLG libraries, as part of the cataloging process for new acquisitions, will first search the files of the RLG data base. The search will be made via video terminals installed at both NYPL and Columbia, connected to the computer at the New York Public Library. If the local search is successful, the bibliographic record found will be modified as required via terminal editing and added to the file of the particular institution. Cataloging products will be produced if desired. If the local search is unsuccessful, the user will rekey his request, which will be transmitted from the NYPL computer via communication lines, to the computer at the Library of Congress and will initiate a search of the LC files by invoking its programs.

If this latter search is unsuccessful, the institution initiating the search will revert to local cataloging procedures. If the search is successful, that is, if a "hit" is made between the search query and the LC data base, the record will be transmitted on-line from the computer at LC to the computer at NYPL and will become part of the requesting institution's cataloging file. The LC MARC record may also be modified by the RLG institution prior to adding it to the institution's file. In addition, the original MARC record will be kept. In all instances the cataloging record will be posted to the union catalog.

During the pilot project, the RLG will have the opportunity to begin the development of future RLG systems. The member libraries will improve their cataloging throughput time by sharing machine-readable cataloging data within RLG and having rapid access to the LC files. The records will be used for catalog card production although this product is seen only as an interim one; long-range goals of RLG include the elimination of card catalog maintenance by including all new entries in a computer-based catalog only. In addition, the cataloging services provided by the pilot operation will support the present NYPL book catalog program.

The Phase I project will utilize as much as possible the already-developed computer systems at both NYPL and LC. Since both organizations have similar hardware configurations (IBM 370 series) and both use an IBM support system (Customer Information Control System), modifying existing procedures to install the link between the two is relatively simple.

As you know, LC for some time has been involved in the design and implementation of a system to satisfy the requirements for placing our collections under bibliographical control and to provide tools used by LC, e.g., the name and subject authorities, cataloging records, etc., to the national and international bibliographic community. In order to provide both internal and external services, the MARC Development Office has expended considerable effort over the past several years installing an on-line system. This facility (called the Multiple Use MARC System) is presently used in the Library of Congress for several operations, e.g., the correcting of MARC records, creating records for materials in process of cataloging, and searching files, etc.

The MARC Search Service operating under the MUMS system provides on-line access currently to the entire file of MARC records for books. The on-line MARC file is updated nightly to reflect all records added, corrected, or deleted during the previous day. Records still in the process of verification are included, as are Cataloging in Publication (CIP) records. The Service will also provide access to records for materials in process, COMARC records, records for serials, maps, and films, and Canadian, Australian, British, French, and other national bibliography records, as these files become available on-line.

A request by LC card number directly retrieves the corresponding unique bibliographic record, if the desired record has already been input to machine-readable form in preliminary or final form. The full LC printed card cataloging information is displayed. If the LC card number is not know, the desired record may be searched using either an author/title or a title search key. Any combiniation of main or added author and bibliographic or other title may be used in creating the search key.

If more than one record (up to a maximum of 30 records at the present time) are retrieved as the result of a search key, the several records are displayed consecutively in filing sequence by main entry and title, or by title and data in the case of a title search. If more than 30 records are retrieved, or if the searcher wishes to limit the number of records displayed, a qualifier may be specified. A qualifier is a word or phrase that must be present somewhere within a designated field or group of fields. For example, if the qualifier "author-Collins" is added to the author/title search key, only those records matching the search key and having the word "Collins" in either a main or added entry field will be displayed. In most cases, this qualification technique reduces to a very few the number of records displayed.

Additions and improvements to the service now under development include the display of multiple records in brief form on a single screen. The searcher can quickly determine whether the desired record is present and, if it is, command the display of the full record. Additional indexes are also being developed to allow searching by personal or corporate author, subject, series, LC call number, Decimal Classification number, and ISBN. It is this search facility that will be used by the RLG libraries to access the LC data base.

Limited additional software will be required at the Library of Congress to transmit the requested record in the MARC communications format and the ALA extended character set from the LC computer to the NYPL computer, to provide new transaction procedures and possible error conditions.

The software to be used at the NYPL facility also consists principally of components already in existence. The components include a program developed by NYPL staff for updating bibliographic records on-line and a program developed by staff of the Columbia University Libraries for printing 3x5 catalog cards. The catalog card program will require modification to enable it to run at a site other than Columbia and to add certain features to provide the flexibility to satisfy the specifications of several institutions. Additional software must be developed to accept the LC search key commands and transmit them to the LC computer, to receive messages from LC's system, and to process the MARC record.

In order for either party to benefit from the results of the RLC-LC project, it is essential to collect statistical data. These data will support future work at LC and RLG, as well as assist in evolving national network developments. Software will be written for the NYPL computer to capture information about transactions and present this information in a condensed form for analysis. The results will become the basis of a technical report which will be made available to the community. At the end of Phase I project, a final report will be written jointly by the staff of the RLG and LC describing the results of the project and recommending future actions.

The RLG institutions, although working with a limited operational system, will be taking the first step toward the goal of a union catalog. The data collected during the project will provide cost models so the next generation of planning can proceed more effectively based on the results provided by empirical data. Even though Phase I is considered a pilot, cataloging services will be available to the RLG members from the system. The rapid access to LC files should be cost beneficial by reducing local processing needs and providing more timely services.

The transaction loads on the LC computer generated by the RLG activity will also be used by LC as a model for future projections. We will be able to experiment based on traffic loads with procedures for providing access to the LC configuration by outside user demands, and simultaneously servicing internal LC requirements. The data captured by the statistical programs will permit the development of procedures and cost models as well as billing algorithms based on actual experience.

Phase I tests the sharing of resources between two specific library computer systems. The proposed second and third phases explore the extension of this resource sharing to a large number of library computer systems.

As the national network develops and regional networks are created, there will be a need for a system capable of interconnecting these systems and allowing data exchange among a large number of bibliographic data bases. This system is obviously far more complex than that required for Phase I. It must include at least the following: (1) the capability for the different systems to use the networks for different purposes -- author, title, and subject searching, acquisitions and ordering, and interlibrary loan; (2) the capability to interconnect systems which use computers manufactured by different vendors and with different software systems; (3) the capability to protect the various systems connected to the network from the effects of failure at one or more of the other systems on the network; (4) the capability for a system to connect to the national network through a single standard interface. When a network with these capabilities is developed, the full benefits of national interchange of bibliographic data in the on-line mode will be realized.

One of the more promising ways to build such a network is to use a multicomputer as an interface between each regional and/or local system. The interconnection among these systems becomes the national network. We intend to test this approach by actually developing such a mini-computer interface and installing and testing two of them, one each at RLG and LC.

In Phase 2, requirements of the system will be specified, the common network protocol will be agreed upon, hardware will be selected, and detailed plan for Phase 3 will be prepared. This will provide the means for writing a project proposal requesting funds for Phase 3. Phase 3 will be the implementation of the system specified by Phase 2 and will result in an operating system at RLG and LC, which can be extended to other participants.

Assuming that this system is successful, very substantial benefits will result. These include: (1) the establishment and testing of network communication protocol standards; (2) the specification of network hardware; (3) the development of network software logic; (4) the development of a relatively inexpensive system which can be replicated and expanded to form the basis for planning the continuing development of the national bibliographic network.

The national benefits of Phases 1, 2, and 3 are many. Phase I by itself, although only involving RLG and LC, should provide some of the answers to questions we all ask. Phase I, followed by the successful funding and implementation of Phases 2 and 3, will give the community early experience in national network design and the use of communications protocol. We will be able to measure the results of timely access to the MARC files at the Library of Congress; the tape distribution, at best, will always be slower than on-line access. The Library of Congress will be better able to gauge the hardware required to serve a national network. Systems like the one proposed should help stretch the budget of large public and university libraries that are now faced with serious economic problems by making the expenditure of funds to serve LC also serve the national network. Thank you.

* * * *

Reactors

DAVID WEBER: I suppose a person from the West Coast is asked to participate on the assumption he can figure out through distance and objectivity what goes on in the crowded Eastern corridor. So with trepidation I will try. There are three points I offer you as reactor. The first point is that it is well for us to remember that very little indeed is new on the scene of library cooperation. Almost all of the cooperative efforts among academic libraries, with the exception of the use of computers and satellites, are ones that date back 40, 80 or 100 years. Let me cite as an example the formal agreement between Duke University and the University of North Carolina. In 1931 these two institutions agreed to special book collecting areas, and the libraries exchanged author cards for their catalogs. Four years later a messenger service commenced. Full borrowing privileges were extended to all members of each institution.

Thus the Duke-North Carolina plan for cooperation was one of the earliest formal agreements for regional cooperation. It serves as a splendid example of what can be done and, indeed, offers some suggestions for the future. The agreement to share collections was one of its major efforts. Newspapers and government documents were divided between the two institutions as were microtext sets. There were also the assignment of special emphasis in development of research collections in major subject areas, designed so as to prevent duplication wherever possible. For example, Duke took French literature, Religion, Forestry, Late German literature, Fine Arts, and academy publications, while the University of North Carolina took American and Spanish drama, Geology, Folklore, the French Revolution, Linguistics, and Early German literature. Collecting of state documents was divided between the two. Individual large sets were sometimes jointly purchased but placed in the one that was presumed to use it most heavily.

By the early 1950's the surge of cooperative effort had subsided and the program was moving along as a stable and integral part of each institution. In 1953 the presidents of the two universities set up a committee of librarians and faculty to refine, reassess and expand such efforts as justified. There was much more effort about avoiding duplication of expensive items likely to be little used. Interlibrary lending and direct borrowing were extended. The use of union listing and cataloging was expanded. Binding of journals was to be staggered. Delivery of materials was speeded up. The 1955 redefinition of lending policy included stack use for all qualified borrowers of the other institution.

In the 1962 library school thesis by Ardie Lee Kelly devoted to this program is a conclusion that:

> The intention from the beginning was to create in this area of North Carolina a research center that could offer something of what was offered by the great research libraries in the other areas of the United States. The scope of the two collections represents one total resource and that resource is the largest book collection in the South...

> Perhaps one of the greatest handicaps to cooperation and/or coordination of acquisition is the unwillingness of the general faculty to agree to such a plan. They are often not agreeable to the purchase of an item by one library and not the other, but insist on duplicating a journal or set that is really needed in only one collection.

The thesis cites one major set, the Acta Sanctorum, clearly an example which is debatable because of the way in which the set is used, not the frequency with which it is used.

James Govan wrote me back in January that the consensus is that the program is still exceedingly worthwhile to both institutions. Yet, though it is a small point, he mentions that the freedom to concentrate on certain areas of the underdeveloped world has been a big boon to both acquisition programs but is the area where they are running into the most trouble because the lines are becoming fuzzied and because the faculties of the two institutions are tending less to stay within the agreed confines. There is also the exceedingly deep involvement of the University of North Carolina in a statewide university system which has its own ties and loyalties. A March 1976 staff report confirms the program for joint library privileges and interlibrary loan service and coordinated acquisitions programs. It concludes that interlibrary loan continues to grow, acquisitions coordination has been weakened, and bibliographic data sharing now awaits mutual use of a computer system. "While there still appears to be a wide-spread desire to cooperate, no one is doing very much." This report is part of the revitalization. Altogether this has and continues to be a success program. Duke and North Carolina today, only eight miles apart, have total resources which in numbers would rank them only behind Harvard, Yale and Illinois among university libraries on this continent. Thus one can see that the Research Library Group is like an offspring in one sense of that 44 year old North Carolina effort.

Others of this type of effort exist, of course. On the West Coast the newly formed Berkeley-Stanford Research Library Program has the task before it of further improvement of the existing rapid interlibrary loan traffic and commercial delivery of materials, the planned integration of formal acquisition policy statements,the expected addition of transportation of researchers going to the other institution, and the use by both institutions of the BALLOTS automation system for cataloging and for coordinated acquisition planning.

Secondly, I would highlight the comment made by Jim Skipper that "The real challenge and the ultimate objective of RLG is to alter the attitudes of library staffs, faculties, and students concerning library service." To my mind this is the task most needed and indeed the most difficult. When Dr. Skipper spoke before the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science last November 21st he reported that:

> We have reduced, by approximately one-half, the turnaround time between response and request. We have considerably improved the reliability of delivery, and we have found

> that in very few instances is the requested item in active use in the institution which can supply it, which relieves one of our greatest anxieties - that a very active interlibrary access program would cause disruption on the local level and get the local faculty on our backs. This has not happened.

From the experience at North Carolina and at other places, I feel certain that the faculty service (and of course the upper-class and graduate student services) must respond with material held in the other institution almost as rapidly as if the Harvard student, for example, were to walk across the Charles River and personally borrow a book stored in the New England Deposit Library. It is incumbent upon the university administration to publicly support this different type of access to materials. It is incumbent upon faculty leaders and the library committees to publicly state their encouragement and support for such a new policy of access. It is needed that students be told how the system can work to their advantage. And it is especially incumbent upon library staff - whether they be a clerk at a service desk, a mail room attendant, or an evening supervisor - to be able to explain why the books are miles away and how the system will assuredly work rapidly and smoothly to bring the item to the scholar. I suspect that procedurally and technically we can move much more quickly than we can attain this change in public attitude.

A third point I would make is that there is a considerably increased administrative formality and legal structure that is prevalent in library cooperative programs in the present decade. One can turn to the survey by Carlos Cuadra and Ruth Patrick which indicates that of 125 academic library consortia, 60 percent had been incorporated. One may look at the Center for Research Libraries, OCLC, and of course the Research Library Group to see the effort that is needed when one develops systems for mutual support that are of such large scale.

For the moment, let me add up the size of these four RLG participants in terms of dollars, staff and books. The Research Library Group is, of course, spread over 200 miles. Consider the fact that they have over 25,000,000 volumes, a staff exceeding 3,000, and expenditures that are approaching $50,000,000. To approach anything like that number one has to total the resources of the five campuses of the University of California which are members of ARL, the University of Southern California, Stanford, University of Oregon, University of Washington, Washington State, and the University of British Columbia - these 11 as far apart as are Boston and Miami.

This does indeed require an organizational formality equal to the task. This is expensive but requisite. Given the large scale of these four extraordinarily important and large research libraries, the legal structure and the administrative effort and the broad and constant staff effort is simply what is required by the task they have at hand.

It reminds me of the ARL meeting in Colorado Springs where Stanford's President W. Lyman spoke to us, saying: "One can be reasonably sure that the future of libraries will be shaped by the word 'more': more kinds of materials, more kinds of users, more kinds of services, and more kinds of relationships to other agencies, more dependence on advanced technology, more need for managerial and diplomatic skills of a very high order." The Research Library Group is an excellent and admirable case in point. I applaud its effort.

* * * *

RAY FRANTZ: I have five concerns I would like to express to you very briefly as questions:

1. Is RLG underestimating the difficulties of linking up its computer with LC's? Among the very few to do this has been the project of the Department of Defense, and I understand it was a complicated and costly procedure.

2. Do the four libraries comprising RLG have enough money to do what they propose, even initially?

3. Some ten years ago Yale and Columbia tried to develop an automated system to do their medical cataloging. It failed because the libraries could not agree on cataloging practices. To what extent is this still a problem?

4. What is the cooperative relationship between RLG and OCLC?

5. The RLG group comprises four outstanding ARL libraries, and is to a great extent representing ARL and its interests.

It may be that the ARL should now take a stronger role in cooperating with the Library of Congress and RLG and not simply sit on the sidelines. It may be also that Fred Kilgour handed us a great opportunity to pursue this when he said that ARL might undertake the cataloging design and code of the new data base.

I am not for a moment saying that there should be an adversary relationship, nor am I implying that with RLG and LC. I think what concerns me is that committees, particularly in ALA, can make decisions about such things as the MARC format that have wide-ranging implications; whereas, ARL has very little to say about this. I think our association probably should consider quite closely now what its role should be in helping LC-RLG, to make this a combined effort of the research libraries involved, and not leave it only to ALA or to the other groups.

* * * *

Discussion

JAMES SKIPPER: I am personally assured that it can and will work because the attack on the problem is based on existing systems; we are not really developing a new characteristic. These existing systems are reasonably well known; there is a compatibility between the hardware used at LC and at the New York Public Library. What we are doing, basically, is fooling the Library of Congress computer into thinking that the query coming from RLG is coming from the terminal within the Library of Congress, and they now have that capacity. Perhaps Mr. Welsh would like to expand on the technical complications of that.

Do we have enough money to do the job? The RLG executive committee is convinced that we do. We have estimates from John Knapp, who is our vice president for systems. We intend to put this on a partial cost recovery basis during the developmental phase and a full cost recovery basis after the 18 months period.

What about the past failure in the medical library effort? I can not comment on that because I was not intimately involved. All I can say is that I am convinced personally that in the ten years since that failure, libraries have learned an awful lot about the necessity of commiting themselves to a common course of action. They are convinced that no one institution can create its own computer-based system. A joint effort is necessary to make the effort effective. They have to commit themselves to common standards of cataloging, and this has been agreed to.

Ray Frantz asked a question about the relationship between RLG and OCLC. My position on that is one of greatest admiration. I think Mr. Kilgour and his group have created perhaps the most important development in librarianship certainly in this century, and no one should think that because RLG chooses to explore a different mode of access to a national data base, that this implies criticism of OCLC. It is not so. Fred Kilgour could not go out and tell 50 or 60 libararies in his region to convert to a common cataloging practice. RLG can not commit itself to this particular objective and this is the essential difference between the two.

The ARL connection with LC is an interesting one. When I was executive director of ARL we had a lot of discussion as to whether ARL should become an operating agency or remain an association, as it had been in the past. The Slavic program and the Chinese program were the first two operating situations that ARL got into, and it may very well be in your interest to go beyond that sometime in the future.

WILLIAM AXFORD: Could I ask what are John Knapp's cost estimates?

JAMES SKIPPER: I can not quote to the penny, but we have been convinced that with the four member institutions, we can operate Phase 1 at a record unit cost of about $2.60 to $2.80 with four members participating.

WILLIAM WELSH: I will try a different tack on anwering that first question, and say that of course we are not certain. We would not be undertaking a pilot project if we had all the answers. This is what Phase 1 is really all about -- to give us the data which will determine our course of action. The money that we have is based on the best estimate available; but it is a pilot project to demonstrate whether we can proceed at that level or not.

With respect to cooperation, I think the entire attitude, fortunately forced on us by the economy, is quite different now that it was ten years ago. Ten years ago everyone had a lot of money, and everyone went their own way. Now we are forced to come back to a cooperative mode, and I think that the standards that will result will be to the benefit of all of us.

The fifth point is the one that I find most troublesome, and that is the question about ALA, ARL, and LC. I do not have an answer. I wish I did, because it is true that we are in a period of development of standards. It is almost a certainty that some protocols will be developed in this relationship between LC and RLG. It is also true that when we go to IFLA in August, we will be talking about the development of standards which will be promulgated or made available to the national and international library communities in October of 1977 in Brussels.

We have the ability now to develop an international standard more rapidly than we do a national standard. We have the ability to communicate more effectively with the National Library of Canada, the British Library, the French National Library, than we do with the group in this room. There are committees established in ALA that give us the opportunity to forge more effective communications, but there are not similar groups organized within ARL. I wish that were the case. I do not know what, for example, the problem would be if you established some committees on Romanization and the handling of non-Roman alphabets and to consider our timetable for the conversion of machine-readable data. We are faced with a very critical problem affecting most certainly each of you in this room. We have a task force working at home, but it will not reflect the joint views of ARL, and I think this is a very serious shortcoming. I do not know what the answer is, because there are a great many efforts involved.

The MARC system was developed in the most uneconomical way possible because it was done democratically. New standards are being developed, and we do not really have an effective communication with this very distinguished and very important community. After all, LC is a research library.

JOHN McDONALD: I guess I feel a little challenged by Ray Frantz's point number five. It is true that ARL is not an operating agency, and we have not been able to take the direct course that perhaps Mr. Frantz is advocating, but I would remind all of you that we have been sponsors of some very important studies that have led to some of these developments, and I think we can be proud.

I had a question for Mr. Welsh that I think relates to this. One of the studies that we conducted and hope to build upon was the SILC study, and it seems to me as I listen that what is being done now in connection with RLG does move to some of the objectives of the SILC proposal. To be sure, it does not involve as broad a segment of the ARL through the networks that would have been involved in what we hoped to do there, but for various reasons, we came to the conclusion that that effort was not timely. That does not mean, however, that it can not happen later, and perhaps what the ARL and LC are doing together will lead to that development. Maybe Mr. Welsh would like to comment on this, or David Weber. who was very active in helping us develop what he referred to as "Son of SILC" the other day in a board meeting.

DAVID WEBER: I would very much like to comment, because I share that view completely. I think that what we are doing will also serve as a pilot project for the problems you expected to explore in the SILC effort. As a matter of fact, you will remember that I proposed this very approach as a pilot, so I am now optimistic that this will provide some of the answers that we had sought in SILC.

I think it is just a matter of time that SILC may arrive again in another form, hopefully not in Alexandria, however; but I think this experience we have will give us the data that we desperately need.

ROBERT VOSPER: I would like to take advantage of Mr. Welsh's mention of IFLA, and emphasize the point to which he was referring. I think in terms of this whole question of standardization for cataloging, the successful development of the universal bibliographical control operation, that IFLA's contribution is one of tremendous importance in modern librarianship. The developments have occurred because of this international organization, and except for the Council on Library Resources, the American participation has been inadequate. I have been urging for some time that the American library community must take a full place in helping the international standardization through UBC to move in compatible directions for us, as well as for the rest of the world.

STANLEY McELDERRY: I want to just point up the contrast between RLG's activities and what we have referred to as the electronic networks. This was a point I tried to make yesterday. I think RLG represents the efforts on the part of a few libraries to effect very close initimate cooperation on a wide range of activities, going all the way from collection development through data processing in the broad sense of the term. I think most networks represent a bibliographic data base management activity and the number of service bureau kinds of activities, but largely related to catalog support and in some cases, acquisition activities. There is a question of how intimately they can support international operations of a unique character. So what I would like to emphasize here is that we are talking about an organization structure that is small enough in numbers to effect a very close working relationship, which I doubt could be done on a broad scale as is done in electronic network computing. I just do not see these two as compatible. This is fully appreciated about RLG, but I think its pattern may emerge because of the possibility on the one hand of access at the national level to bibliographic data. I am assured by Mr. Welsh that all the questions I had raised yesterday are answered by him. This provides a wide range of opportunities for large libraries that have enough volume of activity to do a lot of internal computing, so that facility plus developments in the minicomputer field that will enable us to handle a lot of internal computing puts the research library into a somewhat different stance with regard to networks than is currently the case. I personally think that we may see a somewhat more independent position with regard to networks for some of the functions, rather than depending on the network for a broad range of activities. I think the RLG pattern is the way that it is going to have to be used to effect very substantial changes in the way libraries operate internally.

JOHN LORENZ: I think the ARL board of directors must have been psychic the day before yesterday, because in its meeting it voted the acceptance of a new task force on national library system development. I think this is what is being called for here, to some degree. I would also like to underscore something that Mr. Welsh said, and that is that LC is one of the member libraries in ARL, so I think we have a connection; it is automatic.

FREDERICK KILGOUR: There was a meeting at the Library of Congress two weeks ago today to discuss the interrelationship between the Library of Congress computer and the New York Public Library computer, and there were two major questions that came out on that. I was listening with both ears to what you said in hope that I would get an answer, and then Mr. Skipper produced something that terrified me. The two proposals were that it could be done as though the computer could be a terminal, and/or BALLOTS computer could be a terminal, or it could be done on a hardware and IBM software system. The reaction of the group, I think, was largely that it should be hardware independent and software independent. Although BALLOTS has IBM equipment, it could not use the intercomputer proposal that was being made. I thought I heard you say that it will not be until the second phase that you would work on the hardware independent relationship, and if that is true, I would urge you to do it right at the start. When Mr. Skipper said that it was going to look like a terminal, this means that it is going to be a formated record which goes out, not a MARC-2 record, and you will not be complying with the American communications standard. I think this would be a real error, and I think you ought to get those two items reviewed so that you can comply with the standards in Phase 1.

WILLIAM WELSH: Let me just comment on the first point. I agree completely. The reason we did not proceed to make it independent in the first place was the desirability of getting something going as quickly as possible, taking advantage of what we already had. We are certainly working toward that. That is the ultimate objective. I will go back and will talk about that some more. However, I agree.

FREDERICK KILGOUR: I want to speak to Ray Frantz. There really is not a major problem in the computer-to-computer interface in this type of application. As a matter of fact OCLC already does it, and as you know, we are on the way to having a remote computer in the SOLINET area, which will be the same kind of an interface. So this has been resolved with other types of computer where one does not know what the other computer is going to do. This is a real problem, but the way they will set it up almost certainly is that the LC computer will be asking the New York Public Library computer if it has got something. This will work all right. The RLG computer knows that a message is going to be coming back and is waiting for it.

STEPHEN SALMON: I wanted to ask what sort of timetable you have in mind for Phases 1 and 2?

JAMES SKIPPER: Phase 1 will be nine months developmental and nine months operational.

WILLIAM KURTH: I was struck by Mr. Skipper's comment on the change that would be wrought by having faculty and other users having access to the collections of a large number of libraries. I would like to stress the importance that I consider this whole issue has for informing faculty and other users before we move ahead too rapidly to make them aware of what is happening through various means. I think in some respects we can do this individually; but perhaps we ought to collectively give this some thought, not necessarily as an ARL point of view, but perhaps consider it at a future meeting: the relationship and the responsibility we bear to library users to keep them informed uniformly and evenly as we develop our new and more accurate bibliographic systems.

WILLIAM AXFORD: I hope I can take the privilege of a moderator to make some concluding remarks. One would be that if you read, as I think all of us do, the unremitting litany of misery in the Chronicle of Higher Education with respect to the present straits of higher education, I find a meeting such as this to be very stimulating and very encouraging, partly because of local circumstances, but partly because of the history of research libraries, and the history of librarianship, as a matter of fact. I think that in this present steady state or whatever we are working in, libraries and the profession is uniquely equipped to respond to it in the sense that the growing interdependency of all types of institutions is something that we have recognized back in the good old depression days in the 1930's, I suppose. So when you read in the Chronicle of what is happening to our campuses, it is very encouraging to come together here and suddenly discover what is happening to the libraries. Somehow or other we are responding to the challenge of a new era, and I think our accomplishments today are incredible. As a matter of fact, I think they probably far outstrip what is going on in the level of higher education above us.

I have one concern that I would just like to express to Mr. Skipper and Mr. Welsh. It may be personal, but many other people feel the same way. This is rather heady atmosphere, and I certainly share Frederick Kilgour's confidence that these problems can be solved. I do see some dollar figures there that bother me at both ends. As we move into a less affluent environment, even less affluent for RLG and LC possibly, my concern here is that in the excitement of the development of the national bibliographic data base and being able to experiment with RLG on developing some of those capabilities, since we are also suddenly dependent on LC now for MARC cataloging, for the subject control programs, and the other augmentations of that -- we are dependent on that cataloging no matter what kind of data base we are using -- I would hate to see this basic program of LC in any way jeopardized by moving too quickly, to rapidly into networking at the expense of having something to network. In other words, we are all facing cataloging problems back home based on the fact that, as good as MARC is, it still is not what it ought to be. I would hate to see your timetable for 1980 for having all current cataloging in machine-readable form jeopardized by this wonderful and exciting new project.

WILLIAM WELSH: It is so rare that somebody tells me that I am moving ahead too rapidly. I want to assure you that I share your views about the cost of all of this. I think that LC, and I imagine each one of your institutions, have all spent a lot more for development than we ever dreamed of doing. It is costing much, much more. To refer again to the comment I made about development of the MARC format, we have the capability -- I think it is something like 35 access points. I wonder as we get down the line and begin to apply these, how we are going to narrow that down. Mr. Kilgour has already been pressuring us for a long time to have a less complex MARC. As we develop the access points, the search key strategy and develop the indexes, I am certain we are going to have to introduce some constraints that we did not set out to do. So, we are encouraged by your caution.

WILLIAM AXFORD: Are there any other comments before we close this section of the meeting?

JOHN LORENZ: I think there is one other virtue in LC, and that is that it is a public agency which reports to the Congress, which in effect reports to us. We are the national interest in this whole picture, and I think that this national interest can be expressed through the Congress, and LC will be pleased to respond to that kind of expression of national interest. So, I think, again, having this leadership in LC is having it in the right place, because it is a public agency.

* * * *

THE ROLE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS IN NETWORKS;
Report of the NCLIS Study

Alphonse Trezza

I would like to take this opportunity to do two things this morning, if I might. Mindful of the importance of keeping all groups, especially a group such as ARL fully informed of what the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science is doing, I am going to tell you briefly about a couple of our activities just so you are aware of what we are doing in areas which are of interest and can affect you. I was interested in a comment about ARL's involvement or non-involvement in the development of standards through ALA. My only comment concerns involvement - how do you make sure that all interested and affected groups are involved that want to be -- it simply is impossible. I can never, for example, appoint a committee or task force which would have one member of every single association that thinks it ought to be on it. What we do instead is to look at the problem, decide on the size of the committee, and who are the five or seven people that might bring light and help to this problem. Then you select them, and once the individuals are selected, you can look at the memberships they hold, and you normally see that they probably represent organizations such as ARL, ALA, and sometimes LC, depending on the purpose of the committee. I would suggest that one of the responsibilities of the ARL office might be to look at the make-up of their membership on the key committees in the ALA and NCLIS and other groups, and where they see there is an ARL member to contact that person and say, "In addition to your being a member of that committee, would you also make sure that we are fully informed of what is going on, so that if something is required by our organization, we can be sensitive to it and be told while it is going on, and not learn about it when the record is published?" In other words, place an obligation on your members to keep the Association informed through its staff, and then you can respond.

The Commission has added Ruth Tighe as a new staff member. She joined the staff on May 3rd. We are in the process of interviewing for one professional position. I got a call yesterday informing me that the House Committee on Appropriations has approved our budget request. We will be increasing our secretarial staff by two. We have been requesting additional secretarial staff for three years. Our full staff will now consist of nine persons -- five professional, and four secretarial. We do not plan to request additional staff for the next two or three years.

Regarding the Higher Education Act, Title II-C, I want to remind you that in the Commission's National Program Document there is a statement about the importance of unique and major resource collections. Some time ago I talked to Stephen McCarthy, and asked him to draft a discussion paper in which he will attempt to define and describe the criteria for determining what is a unique and major resource collection that should be available nationwide. Do all 104 ARL members fit this definition? The obvious answer is no; but how many do, and is it the library's whole collection or a part of the collection? Who will provide criteria for inclusion in the regulations? Government bureaucrats will, and you may or may not be involved in that decision making.

What we are trying to do by developing this paper is to provide the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources with the information they can use in writing the regulations. Dr. McCarthy assures me that he will have a draft which we will then share very widely with of course some ARL members, among others. We will need your immediate input. We are going to have to be ready by the time Congress passes the bill.

In our efforts to work more closely with the Office of Education, I met with Dr. Bell and offered the Commission's services in support of the Office of Libraries and Learning Resources. I suggested that we operate as an advisory committee to that Office. Dr. Bell and Dick Hays like the idea and we are now developing the appropriate mechanisms for implementation. We will have a direct relationship with that Office and our strength is that, as an independent agency, we do not necessarily have to agree with the Administration's position. Our role can be one where we can participate in developing Administration policy.

John McDonald talked to you about the copyright issues. The NCLIS, as you know, is undertaking a library photocopying study. The advisory committee to the study consists of one representative each from three organizations - ARL, ALA, and SLA. In addition there are three persons representing publishers and authors. The committee of six worked with the Commission staff in developing the Request for Proposal; they also, along with some of our commissioners, reviewed all of the proposals submitted and unanimously agreed on who should be awarded the contract. This week the official letter went out, and I can publicly announce that Market Facts, Inc., Washington, D.C. has been awarded the contract. Obviously this study is important to ARL libraries. I urge you to fully cooperate if you are selected as one of the libraries in the study sample. It is not going to be an easy questionnaire; you will be asked to gather facts over a two to four week period. It is going to require work on your part, and we ask you to please make the effort to help us gather valid data so we can suggest solutions to problems of library photocopying. If we can develop the pattern of library photocopying and gather facts that are valid, maybe we can resolve the problems.

You will recall that in the revision of the copyright law (S.22), there is a provision which was recommended by the National Commission well over a year ago, that there be a review of the section on library photocopying in 1980. That suggestion was supported by the six library associations (ARL, ALA, SLA, AALL, MLA) and put in their documentation to the committee. It was adopted. This would mean, therefore, that our study and the work of CONTU during the next two years will form the basis for any review or revision of the photocopying part of the copyright act in 1980.

I have had a question on the status of the White House Conference. The President was asked a question in La Crosse, Wisconsin by a student from the University of Wisconsin, River Falls. His question: "When will you be appointing 15 citizens to the advisory board for the 1977 White House Conference, since a college student has already been recommended to you by Wisconsin National Committeeman Harvey J. Fish?" The President responded,

> The Personnel Office of the White House is in the process of trying to collect the names of citizens

> all over this country that will make up the advisory board. I can't give you the precise time or date that those recommendations will come from the White House Personnel Board (Office), but I will check on it. I know they are in the process. I think we ought to have the kind of a White House Conference you are talking about. Whether we can do it this year or not, I can't make a commitment, but libraries are an essential part of our intellectual, academic areas, and we ought to have a White House Conference. We will, but I can't give you a precise time schedule either on the names or on the conference.

I received a phone call from the Office of Management and Budget informing me of the President's statement. I asked if any action would be taken. They hedged. If you wish to take any action, you have to do it in the next couple of months, especially those of you who are in states where the primaries have not been held yet. You can write to the President or have your congressmen, especially Republican congressmen or senators, write to the President. First of all, thank him for the support of the White House Conference, and urge him to issue the call for the Conference. Point out that if the President sends up the budget request immediately, it will still take all of 1977 and 1978 to hold the state conferences. The national Conference can not be held until 1979.

I want to take this opportunity to inform you that the President has announced his intention to nominate four persons to be members of the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science. This was in a White House press release.

The four persons are: Ralph A. Renick, of Miami, Florida, Vice President/ News Director, WTVJ-TV, Miami, Florida. He will succeed Harold Crotty who has resigned. This is for the remainder of a term expiring July 19, 1977. Frederick H. Burkhardt, of Bennington, Vermont, President Emeritus, American Council of Learned Societies, Bennington, Vermont. This is a reappointment for a term expiring July 19, 1980. Marian Pollensky Leith, of Raleigh, North Carolina, Acting State Librarian, State of North Carolina, Raleigh, North Carolina. She will succeed William O. Baker whose term expired. This is for a term expiring July 19, 1980. Mildred E. Younger, of Los Angeles, California, member, Board of Directors, Los Angeles Library Association and other voluntary work with health and cultural organizations in Los Angeles, California. She will succeed Leslie Dunlap whose term has expired. This is for a term expiring July 19, 1980. Upon confirmation by the Senate, the President intends to redesignate Dr. Burkhardt as Chairman.

I want to take this opportunity to express the Commission's appreciation and thanks to Leslie Dunlap, who served the Commission well during his term as a member. We surely are going to miss his understanding and insight into our problems. At the same time, I would like to thank John Lorenz, who served in two capacities: he served as a stand-in for Quincy Mumford and then for one year, while serving as the Acting Librarian of Congress, was a member of the Commission. John's contribution to the commission is obvious to all of you.

Also, I would like to thank John McDonald for developing such a wonderful working relationship with the National Commission. It is important that the National Commission work closely with the major associations such as ARL and ALA, and through people like John McDonald and Robert Wedgworth, this is possible. I will assure you that I will do my best to continue to work closely with ARL as well as the other association.

* * * *

Now, let me go on to the Library of Congress's role in networks. This is a report on the NCLIS study of the Library of Congress's role in the emerging national library network. First of all, the study involves a survey of what developments are underway at LC and at libraries and networks in the United States, which are pertinent to providing services to networks of libraries. The object of the survey is to pinpoint missing components and to collect requirements for services which might be best provided by LC. Secondly, to keep the survey to manageable proportions,the data collected is being restricted to the following potential roles of LC: distribution of catalog data; distribution of authority control data; union catalog maintenance (national, regional, local); support of reference services; training and standards.

The survey is being conducted by personal interview using a questionnaire as a guide. The questionnaire collects quantitative and descriptive data about a network and its plans, and forms a "talking point" to elicit discussion about LC's complementary role. A cross-section of libraries is being interviewed: research, large public, small public, special, county networks, state networks, regional networks, etc. This is done in an effort to make sure no ones' requirements get left out.

The review of activities at LC has been completed. The questionnaire has been developed and refined through testing in sample interviews. Approximately one fourth to one third of the facilities to be surveyed have been completed. Some new or novel suggestions have been forthcoming from the interviewees. The investigators reviewing the information collected so far have pinpointed further study areas, which are needed to provide detail for final specifications of LC roles and services.

The technical program at LC is a good one, and is of such a broad scope that it covers all of the requirements which could be laid upon it by national networks or libraries. No important areas have been left out. Although the technical scope is adequate there is no specific commitments in the form of a plan to offer services in a specified quantity to specified users beginning at a specified time. This obviously has to be done and must carry with it all of the budgeting and planning activities required to install operational services, as well as the authorization to do so. The response to the request for interviews has been gratifying. Libraries are willing to dedicate three or more hours of the time of their senior staff to the task.

It was surprising to listen to the range of comment about LC's role. Some libraries had given little or no thought to the question, and had little knowledge of LC's activities while others had extensive knowledge. It followed that those who had little knowledge about LC stated that they should have a primary role in the area of technical leadership and guidance in providing new services, whereas those who were knowledgeable had in mind more specific roles for LC.

Much of the comment was as expected and directed itself to requests for improvement in LC's existing services. It was difficult for most to project themselves into the future; for example, the use of the minicomputers or the replacement of the card catalog. This was especially true of those libraries who as yet have no access to mechanized services of any kind. Libraries upon hearing of current LC projects and plans for new services stated a desire to use such services, asking when they would be available.

All libraries contacted so far requested an increased role for LC in training and standards. Principles can be learned at library school but practical training in automation, LC procedures, and knowledge of what is under development is desired from LC. The extent of what is desired portends a level of effort which probably cannot be carried out as an adjunct to an LC staffer's development or management duties. All of those libraries or networks carrying on development or providing services to others urged that they be kept informed of LC's current procedures and plans. Also quantitative data describing performance is needed in cataloging and acquisition so that these organizations can plan in a complementary manner.

More than one network service expressed the requirement that LC should be the catalog source of "last resort," and that they then could store and process catalogs in a much more efficient manner. In this regard, the role of LC versus the national libraries, agencies and organizations such as NLM, NAL, GPO, and OCLC, was discussed but opinions varied widely. This is a touchy subject with most saying that LC should have a larger role, but that the other agencies and organizations have a right to theirs by virtue of the fact that they are presently far ahead of LC in providing really timely services. One network presently using OCLC was well along in plans to expand the capabilities of their communication links so that all types of services could be served. These plans included communications to LC's computers, and a strong statement was made that LC should adopt one of the existing standards in this area, rather than create one of its own.

Now, that is only a progress report. We have a long way to go before the project is finished -- not in time, but in work. Actually, we are supposed to have it finished by the end of June, but I suspect that we will probably have to have an extension of one or two months. We are looking toward its completion by September, so that at your fall meeting, we would hope to have a full report.

Let me close by saying that the National Commission is definitely supportive, and has said so in writing, of the LC-RLG proposal which you heard about this morning. We think it is an important step in our national network plans. We are trying to develop a matrix, which will show all the various projects that are underway, whether they are the ones that we have started or ones that were developed through other groups; so you can see, I think, how we are moving toward implementation of our national program. Your association, for example, has undertaken studies which meet some of the objectives of our national program. The development of our matrix is important for this reason: if you apply for grants of various kinds, there are many, many times when the granting agency will contact my office and say, "How does this fit into the national program," or "Does it fit into the national program, and if it doesn't fit the national program, is it important enough to fund?" It is incumbent upon you to keep us informed so we can be supportive. Secondly, as you think about studies and projects, look at the national program and say, "How does it fit?" If it does not, I have two questions: one, is it important to the national program, or two, is it perhaps that your proposal is not one that ought to be funded.

I will continue to keep you informed and to work closely with you. We are sensitive to your comments, critiques, and criticisms; just as we are not especially shy about expressing our views. I would be glad to answer any questions.

RICHARD DE GENNARO: I want to ask Mr. Trezza whether ARL's interest and initiative in the national periodicals center fits into that matrix?

ALPHONSE TREZZA: I am sorry, I meant to mention that project. The national periodical system task force, has Vernon Palmour as our principal investigator. He is spending 40 percent of his time on the project, which has been operational since January. We have had two task force meetings so far. The task force consists of about 30 people representing all of the various groups in the country, and as Douglas Bryant told you, four members from ARL are on the task force. At the last meeting we had we received the two letters Mr. Bryant referred to, and the report of your committee and of the Center for Research Libraries'Board, expressing their wish to participate and to be supportive.

What we did that day was to, first, present some models for discussion purposes. We have presently four different models, all the way from taking what exists today as it is and simply trying to do a better job of coordinating it at the one end, to a single center at the other end. We agreed to concentrate on one model as a basis for further exploration. Some of the assumptions are: if you have 2,000 titles, you can satisfy 50 percent of demand; and if you have 10,000 titles, you can fill 90 percent of the requests. We speculated on a plan to establish a number of 2,000 title collections across the country in either a major state which has enough material resources, or in a regional area. The next level would have 10,000 titles. How many of these do we need? One, two, three? The Library of Congress could serve as the source for the last 10 percent. Through the CONSER project they could refer requests to other ARL libraries that have the titles not in the Library of Congress collection. Would that model work? We are studying the possibility.

As part of the study, Vernon Palmour is visiting a number of organizations and agencies so he can get the latest information possible. He visited with CRL last week and looked into their facilities. Mr. Palmour had a long talk about LC-RLG and how it might fit into this operation. By our next meeting on June 11 we hope to arrive at a consensus by the task force as to which model we are going to pursue in detail so that by the end of December we will adopt a policy recommendation and start a national periodicals system and, hopefully, by January 1, 1978, the organization will be operative, even if it means we must start with existing resources and existing money. We are going to start, and I am sure we will need foundation support. We can then go for the Federal and state funds. We will keep you fully informed as we progress. Certainly at your fall meeting we will have a much more detailed report.

JOHN LORENZ: Who is the investigator for the LC role?

ALPHONSE TREZZA: The principal investigator for the LC study is Lawrence Buckland, President of Inforonics. The Library of Congress staff member is Henriette Avram. Those are the two principal people.

ROD DUCHESNE: I would like to make a comment here, if I may. This is less a question or a comment and more a point of information and an invitation. There is a study which is being undertaken by the National Library of Canada which relates to what was just described by Mr. Trezza, and I thought he might like to plug it into his information. I would like to invite anyone who has a direct interest in the Canadian scene to be in touch with us. The title of the study was "Canadian Computerized Bibliographic Center Study." I will not go into its full terms of reference, but it is essentially to review the developing Canadian computerized library network scene and to report with recommendations. The time scale is approximately 18 months. I would just like to close by inviting anyone who has any direct interest in the Canadian scene to be in touch with us with any comments or suggestions or information that you may have that you feel is relevant. The objective of making this invitation is that we would very much like to interface directly with the United States networks and to be part of North America. There are differences in Canada, of course, but we would like to join North America and be part of it with you. Thank you.

WARREN BOES: I wonder if there is any move on the part of the Commission to see that research libraries will continue to have a representative on the Commission?

ALPHONSE TREZZA: Thank you for the opportunity to comment on that. The Senate action on the new nominations will take place in the next few weeks. Once that action is complete, I would urge ARL and ALA, as well as others, to write to the Presidential appointments office. Recognize the fact that the appointments have been announced, and point out that without trying in any way to critize the individuals appointed, the fact is that the way the Commission is now constituted, there is not any practicing research librarian represented, and that this is an unfortunate void. The reason why it is important to do it now is that we have two more vacancies coming up this July. The terms of two Commissioners expire. They are: Andrew Aines, who is with the National Science Foundation; and Catherine Scott, who is a special librarian. They may be reappointed or replaced; so if you are to have any impact on the appointment, you have got to take positive steps and write, making suggestions as well as raising the issue.

We did cooperate with ARL and ALA and some names were submitted. None of the suggestions were selected. Reaction and suggestions from the field are essential, and I really do think we ought to do our best to make sure we do have a research librarian on the Commission. We do not have a research librarian such as Leslie Dunlap. I think we need one, and I urge you to make that effort.

SUSAN MARTIN: It is my understanding that President Ford has asked his Domestic Council to come up with a proposal for a national information policy by this fall. I was wondering if you could give us any additional information on this, or discuss what the implications might be?

ALPHONSE TREZZA; That is a difficult question to answer. That action was precipitated by Vice President Rockefeller, who is Chairman of the Domestic Council. It is essentially a thrust for science information, and was supported by Senator Kennedy and the bill for reestablishing a science advisor to the President. The Commission is aware of these developments and Dr. Burkhardt, about a month ago, met with Dr. Stever of the National Science Foundation and discussed the Commission's participation as matters develop in this direction. I have talked to Quincy Rogers, who is the Domestic Council person who has the responsibility of producing the proposal. The problem is that he has got to produce it by September 1st. I have offered to use some of our funds to help plan a special conference with individuals who I feel need to be represented in that decision-making process. I suggested he develop an agenda based on specific goals or objectives and produce a background paper for such a meeting. It could run two or three days, involve a representative group and be held at a location such as the Airlie House. I have not had any reaction to that suggestion. I can assure you we are concerned about it, and we are trying to keep on top of what is going on; but that is all I know about it. I do not really know what they are going to do. They have been talking to Andrew Aines, who is experienced and knowledgeable in the area of science information. That is the latest information I can give you.

* * * *

ADVISORY GROUP ON NATIONAL BIBLIOGRAPHIC CONTROL

Lawrence Livingston
Council on Library Resources

Because I am speaking last, I did not prepare a formal paper for you. I thought that I had best wait to see what Messrs. Kilgour, Welsh, Trezza, Susan Martin and the others had to say, because, really, we are all talking about the same thing: national bibliographic control. I thought that I would start by giving you my definition of national bibliographic control, and telling you what three of your agencies in Washington are doing in the pursuit of the control; explain how this fits with what others are doing and then wind up by telling you what I think are the critical next steps in bibliographic control.

My definition of National Bibliographic Control is a coherent effort coordinated at the national level to marshall all the nation's complementary resources and capabilities so as to provide comprehensive control over each bibliographic item, and to make the products and services of that control effectively available to the user.

Now this definition has several corollaries; I will give you some of them, you can think of others: (1) there needs to be a division of labor in the creation and maintenance of the national bibliographic data base; (2) to create a truly national data base, the records so created and used must be accepted nationally, irrespective of where created; (3) national bibliographic records must move freely in interchange without hindrance or restrictions on their receipt or use. When I say move freely, of course I am talking about among not-for-profit organizations; (4) adequate access to all the components of national bibliographic files must be available to all those who have the requirements for it, and an array of access modes is required; (5) national bibliographic control involves other agencies besides libraries. I think we must always keep this in mind; (6) there is and will be a continuation of local autonomy in practice, products, services, and operations; (7) national bibliographic control efforts must mesh with those at the international level. In my definition, I said coordinated at the national level. You notice that I did not say mandated from the national level; (8) although much emphasis is placed on computer networks and on-line services, it must be understood that some libraries and other agencies will remain dependent on catalogs and other products printed on paper for a long time to come.

With some of those thoughts as background, CLR, the National Science Foundation, and the National Commission in 1974 convened a meeting in Rosslyn, Virginia on the subject of national bibliographic control. A small group was set up to write a background paper in preparation for the meeting. Representation across the board was invited from libraries, publishing, abstracting and indexing services and the Copyright Office; observers from Canada and Mexico were present. That meeting labored for two days on the subject of National Bibliographic Control and came up with a set of recommendations. It was the first time in my experience that people of these diverse professions had actually sat down together and discussed these things to this level of detail. I will read these nine recommendations to you, and then the rest of my talk will describe what we have done about them.

Let me begin with the ninth recommendation first and the others will then fall into place. The last one was to the effect that the three sponsoring agencies should implement a continuing agency,which would keep up the momentum generated by the Rosslyn meeting, and would worry about national bibliographic control on a continuing basis. That group has been set up and I will describe it to you after I read the recommendations.

First, it was recommended that this continuing group define the minimum bibliographic record required for item identification. Incidentally, recommendations have been printed in the Library of Congress Information Bulletin several times. I am only giving you the outline of each. For the complete recommendations, please see LC Information Bulletin, Volume 33, No. 25 for June 21, 1974.

Recommendation number two: study the requirement for additional standards and recommend action in this direction.

Number [illegible] promote the interchange of bibliographic records among libraries, [illegible], and across professional lines.

Number four: devise record formats and content designation schemes for journal articles, technical reports, and other forms of literature not presently covered by the MARC formats.

Number five: study the problem of coupling non-character representation, such as graphics or numerical data to the related bibliographic records.

Number six: promote improved bibliographic access across professional lines--this was repeated as a separate item.

Number seven: devise a national bibliographic name-authority system.

Number eight: study the problem of subject access and make recommendations geared to solutions.

Number nine: this one was to set up the Advisory Group on National Bibligraphic Control, as it is now known.

That group has been set up and the members appointed include: Theodore Brandhorst, director of ERIC Processing and Reference Center, LEASCO; Dan Lacey, senior vice president, McGraw Hill; Dr. Jerrold Orne, professor at the Chapel Hill Library School at the University of North Carolina; Dr. James Carmon, assistant vice chancellor for Computer Services, University of Georgia; Dr. Ronald Wiggington, director of research and development, Chemical Abstract Service; William Welsh, formerly director of processing, Library of Congress and now Deputy Librarian. We tried to get the best people we could for this group, and you can see, we did. As a matter of fact, they were so good that two of them have already been promoted, which precluded their continuing on the committee. Mr. Welsh had to resign, and we have appointed and the sponsors have approved, Henriette Avram to replace him. Dan Lacey got involved in the work on copright legistation and had to resign; Dr. Carol Nemeyer of the Association of American Publishers is his replacement.

This is a good group; it is well balanced. I know it is well balanced because the criticism we get is about equal from those who say that it is dominated by librarians, and librarians who say that they do not have enough vote in it. For your information, three of the present incumbents have library degrees, and among the other group is Henriette Avram, so that I would say your interests are well represented.

The group meets quarterly at the offices of the Council on Library Resources, where we do the administering of the funds, maintain the files, and handle the correspondence. I chair the meetings. We have committed part-time one of our professional staff members as executive secretary for the group, and we have a fulltime administrative assistant, a very good man who handles the minutes and so forth.

This Advisory Group has adequate funding. The method of operation is as follow: first of all, the Advisory Group refers back to the recommendations of the Rosslyn meeting to see what still needs to be done. Any of the members then may bring up items they think are appropriate. These are discussed. If items come up between meetings, they are circulated to the members for consideration before the next meeting.

When the group decides on items for action, it may proceed in one of several ways. It may convene a working party to study the problem, to see what needs to be done. We have two such in operation at the moment. We have one group working on the record format for journal articles and technical reports. That is in response to the recommendation number four. This working party is chaired by Margaret Park. She is at the University of Georgia and works with Jim Carmon, and has a very good reputation. Another working party is working on the name-authority file problem. That one is chaired by Ann Curran of the Boston Public Library, also with much experience and a good reputation in getting things done in the bibliographic area.

The Advisory Group may also recommend standards work to Subcommittee Z-39 of the American National Standards Institute. Jerrold Orne is a member and he chairs the committee. This has been done twice now. The Advisory Group started working on the problem of holding statements for serials in bibliographic files and got out of its depth rapidly and turned that activity over to Z-39, Dr. Orne implemented a subcommittee (Z-39,40), and the work has progressed fairly rapidly. At the moment, they are just about to publicize the final draft resulting from their deliberations. As soon as that activity has taken place with Z39 the work will be given wider circulation for everyone's comment and understanding.

Also out of the deliberations of the Advisory Group came a recommendation to Mr. Orne that Z-39 should take another look at the Standards Account Number (SAN) code. The SAN code has now been published as a standard, I believe, or,if not so, very near publication. In any case, Bowker, the agency which has assumed responsibilty for the maintenance of that code, has begun to number accounts. This took effect in the book trade initially, but it seemed to us that this number had enormous implications, or at least the potential for implication for libraries; and we also felt that these implications perhaps had not received the detailed study that they required, so we asked Mr. Orne to go back, reconvene the working party, and look at the SAN code and its import for libraries. He has agreed to do that. I saw the other day the call for the first meeting of that group.

In addition to working parties and standards activity of that kind, the Advisory Group has decided that it may commission studies. We have one of those in operation. We decided early on that we needed to take a look at the potential of ISBN in libraries. We all know that the book trade uses ISBN extensively. Dealers catalogs prominently display the book number. Many libraries are using ISBN for ordering, but there is a nagging feeling that there is potential for much wider use of ISBN on the one hand, and that maybe ISBN is not totally adequate for all of the potential uses on the other hand. Accordingly, we commissioned a study being done now by one Helen Schmierer of the Univeristy of Chicago library. She is looking into the whole business of the use or the potential use of ISBN in libraries. That report is due within the next six months, and you will be advised as to what Schmierer finds out.

In addition to those modes of operation, the Advisory Group may convene meetings of various kinds. We decided early on that because several people used bar codes in their libraries, it was high time that a systematic look be taken at this technology. We decided that there were enough things that nobody knew about bar codes that we needed to take a systematic look at them. You see, I can foresee the time when, if we do not do something about the proliferation of these codes, your pristine book cover will have five or six bar codes on it. The manufacturer of this book, who sees it as an article in trade, is going to stamp the universal product code on the face, for example. If you do not believe that, look at Argosy magazine.

LC is using bar codes in the in-process file. Several libraries, for example; Chicago, University of Texas at Dallas, University of South Carolina and others, are using bar codes in circulation control systems. Several things need to be examined here. The bar codes themselves: should they be standard? Can they be standardized? Is there a requirement for alphabetic character representation in these bar codes? The bar code on your package of weiners has only numerics in it. Do you need to bar code all numbers? I have no idea, but that is the kind of thing we are going to look at. To that end, we have convened for next week a small meeting just to look at the requirement for study of the bar code problem, and we will be reporting back to you on that. So, we need to look at the bar codes themselves, and also the numbers which are being encoded to see what standardization is required.

Then there is a whole problem of OCR fonts and equipment in the same context.

The Advisory Group also discussed the requirements for bibliographic protocols to permit the exchange of messages between and among systems. Out of that came some emphasis in ALA to push for some standard activities in communication protocols. It is that activity that Mr. Trezza has now picked up and is trying to push for in concert with the Library of Congress, ALA, and some others.

So you get the picture of how the Advisory Group works. It is your Advisory Group and you are free to recommend actions of various kinds. The group is quite flexible. It has some money, and it has some good people on it, and it has a way of doing business that is effective, in my opinion. In the future, we will continue to do things of the kind that I have described.

The results of the work of this Advisory Group are as the name implies, advisory to the sponsors--but you see how effective this can be, because it permits the sponsors to coordinate their funding activities against projects which have been picked out and defined by the working parties of the Advisory Group. This ability to suggest where the three sponsors should concentrate their efforts is the most powerful part of the arrangement; but the group, of course, has no authority to take any final action. Likewise, if a standards activity is decided upon, it gets put into the proper standards formulation channels. If it is advice to the sponsors, the sponsors decide what they are going to do. So you need to understand that process; that is how it works.

Now, what I see now as critical next steps (you will understand quickly from my description of the Advisory Group some of the things I am about to say are outside of the scope of that group, but in my opinion, they are absolutely critical to the future development of national bibliographic control):

I think that the next step needs to be devising the mechanism of bibliographic control, and I refer here to the Library of Congress and the regional networks, principally. We must devise a modus vivendi between and among the Library and the regional networks. I think that phraseology is absolutely apt, because it is precisely the continued viability of these networks that is so critical. James Skipper alluded to this at one point this morning. We need to define a network in much more precise terms than we have done. We need to know what constitutes a viable network, how much geography, how many customers, how many transactions, how many telephone lines, how much money. We do not know this very well. We need to coordinate the funding.

Let me back off and give you one that must come before all of that. We need to decide how many regional networks there are going to be. I think this is an absolutely critical requirement. I am not going to tell you how many regional networks I think there should be, although I have an opinion, but I will predict for you the outer bounds of these numbers. I predict absolutely that there will not be just one; and I think that there will be not more than ten. I think it is up to all of us to decide just how many there will be, where they will be, who is to operate them, and so forth.

It is going to be extremely difficult to coordinate all of the activities that it will take to get these major components of the national networks to work together. It will, for example, require a much higher order of cooperation than has been evidenced in the past. Understand, I emphasize none of this is going to be mandated from Washington. There is a big element of volunteer activity involved here, but I think I can assure you that the pressures are going to be on for more and better cooperation. That is all there is to that. All that we have to do is get behind and push.

* * * *

BUSINESS MEETING

ARL Commission Structure

[See Appendix A for report of Task Force to Study Commission Structure]

MRS. WHITNEY: At the ALA Membership Meeting held in Houston in 1975, the theme of the roundtables was the ARL organization. One of the developments from that meeting was a feeling that the commission structure should be re-examined. As a result, the Board appointed a task force under the chairmanship of Ralph Hopp to look into this. Mr. Hopp is about to give us his report which has been discussed with the Board already. The Board has accepted the report in principle and has recommended the adoption of the recommendations.

MR. HOPP: I will read the three recommendations that the task force has prepared and then I will move their adoption. I will then present the rationale that we drew up in support of these recommendations.

The first recommendation is that "the Board of Directors and the ARL staff should assume the responsibilities presently assigned to the various commissions, with the exception of the Management Commission."

The second recommendation is, "in place of the Commission on Management of Research Libraries, a standing advisory committee to the Office of Management Studies should be created with appropriate representation from the Board, the membership, and others as may prove useful for the OMS program."

The third and last recommendation is that "the commission structure of the ARL should be eliminated."

I move the adoption of these three recommendations. [The motion was seconded].

Just about a year ago, Richard De Gennaro, then president of the ARL, appointed a task force under my chairmanship to analyze the scope and interrelationship of the commissions and the problems they had in fulfilling their responsibilities. We were also asked to consider the role of the ARL Board in relationship to the commissions. Members of the task force were Ray Frantz, who is a current member of the Board; David Laird, one of our younger ARL directors, Stanley McElderry, who, at one time or another, has been chairman of two commissions and is also a former Board member; Basil Stuart-Stubbs, a former Board member; and myself, a former Board member and past president.

It might be useful for you if I were to review briefly the background of the commission structure. The structure was first outlined in a March, 1971 draft report to the Board by then president Tom Buckman. In that report, he identified the major areas of concern and activities of the ARL, and arranged these under what he termed "task groups." These groups were given titles, essentially in use today, for our various commissions. This so-called new form of ARL operation placed all the committees under one or another of the task groups in a kind of hierarchical fashion, thus removing the direct oversight responsibility of the committees for the ARL executive director.

The groups were then named "commissions," rather than task groups, and the plan was then implemented by the Board.

After some two years of operation under this method of organization, it seemed apparent that the interposing of commissions between the working committees and the executive director, while perhaps relieving the executive director of the burden of time consuming responsibilities, also placed him in a position of not having firsthand information of many of the Association's affairs. The commission chairmen regularly met in one session with the Board, and also reported to the membership alternatively in written and oral form.

After experience of some two years in this mode, it became clear that the organization was not functioning satisfactorily. On November 19, 1972, the commission chairmen, the ARL staff, and the Executive Committee met to reconsider the commission structure. That meeting resulted in a placing of the direction of the commissions more directly within the Board, with the Board members serving as chairmen of the various commissions. Also, the commissions were to serve only in an advisory capacity to the Board, rather than having responsibility for the management of the various committees. Committees were then placed directly under the executive director and the ARL office staff for coordination. In addition, task forces for specifically identified concerns were then established.

The commission chairmen and the Board in their continuous review of issues and priorities of the ARL often found that many matters were of interest to and fell within the purview of more than one commission. The membership appeared not to understand the commission structure, a fact that became quite apparent at the May, 1975 Houston meeting during the roundtable discussion session. In order to take yet another look at the commission structure, then President De Gennaro appointed about a year ago the present task force. Meanwhile, the commissioners, always trying to resolve the overlapping areas of responsibility, requested another joint meeting which subsequently was held on December 10, 1975. At that meeting, a number of issues were identified, some effort was made to identify a few top priority concerns, and the responsibility for these was then placed within the individual commissions and the ARL office staff.

As presently functioning, the commissions have as their responsibility to identify problem issues and concerns, set objectives, provide state-of-the-art analyses and assessments of the future directions for ARL. Although the commission chairmen are members of the Board, these responsibilities the task force believes are the proper functions of the Board as a whole, particularly those relating to setting objectives and assessment of the future directions for ARL. At the December, 1975 joint meeting of the commissions, among the high priority issues identified were areas in which the central ARL staff clearly has to take primary responsibility.

So, with this as a brief background on the general commission structure, we are making the first of our several recommendations, which I will now repeat: "the Board of Directors and the ARL staff should assume the responsibilities presently assigned to the various commissions, with the exception of the Management Commission."

As you know, the Office of Management Studies is a special program with a separately identified staff within the ARL office. It is entirely supported by grant funds. There presently is a Commission on Management of Research Libraries, that oversees, along with the executive director, the activities of the OMS. The task force believes that this program requires an advisory group that has continuity, specific expertise in management matters, and should be under the chairmanship of someone chosen for reasons other then simply Board membership. Membership on the committee should not necessarily be limited to ARL members, although we believe that the majority should be from among the membership, and the executive director, we believe, should be an ex-officio member of that advisory committee. The task force believes that the OMS staff increasingly shall be available and drawn upon in a supportive way for ARL staff responsibilities, particularly in areas involving statistics, planning, research, and economic concerns. Assistance in drafting research or project proposals, for example, appropriately could result in the development of techniques and findings of use to the membership in a more general way.

So, our recommendation number two is therefore, that "in place of the Commission on Management of Research Libraries, a standing advisory committee to the Office of Management Studies should be created, with appropriate representation from the Board, the membership and others as may prove useful to the OMS program."

From this brief background regarding the commission structure, it becomes apparent that this pattern of operation, while possessing a certain logic, has not been entirely successful. No attempt has been made to analyze in any thorough fashion why this has been the ARL experience. It is sufficient to observe that in its brief five year existence, the commission structure has been under almost continuous review and attack. If there are proponents of the structure, the task force has not heard of them. Obviously, some change is called for, and therefore, our third and final recommendation is "the commission structure of the ARL should be eliminated."

MRS. WHITNEY: Is there any discussion? The question has been called for. [A vote was taken. The recommendations were voted].

* * * *

ARL Membership Criteria

[The Report of the Subcommittee to Review Criteria for ARL Membership is included as Appendix B of these Minutes. The Report of the Task Force on Criteria for Nonuniversity Membership in ARL is included as Appendix C of these Minutes].

MRS. WHITNEY: During the past year some other task forces and committees have been meeting. I am going to ask two chairmen to report on their particular areas of interest. The first one is Page Ackerman, chairperson of the Task Force on ARL Membership Criteria.

MS. ACKERMAN: There are two groups which are working on membership criteria: The other one, chaired by William Budington is the Task Force on Criteria for Nonuniversity Membership in ARL.

The Subcommittee (of the Board) to Review Criteria for ARL Membership, primarily as a result of discussion at the ARL Board meeting May 7, 1975, was charged with two tasks. One was specifically to review criteria number nine, (and I think most of you realize there are ten quantitative criteria for membership to ARL) which relates to the number of Ph.D degrees granted by an institution. We were also asked to review all of the quantitative criteria for ARL membership, to consider these criteria in and of themselves, to consider their relationship to the work of the Joint Committee on Standards for University Libraries, and to consider them in relation to the work of Mr. Budington's committee.

The subcommittee has identified a long range problem, which we think that the Association should attack with real concentration; and that is the problem of moving from the present emphasis which is almost exclusively on bigness, on size that is implicit in the current criteria, to an effort to supplement the criteria of bigness with some quantitative measures reflective of quality. We have recommended to the Board that this approach be taken, and we have also recommended that criteria number nine be eliminated immediately as a criteria.

The report as presented to the Board is preliminary; we plan to distribute it to the membership. I am asking you to respond to it by the 1st of July. That will give Mr. Budington and me time to produce a joint report, which will be ready for action at the October meeting.

* * * *

MRS. WHITNEY: I will now ask William Budington to report for the Task Force on Criteria for Non-University Membership in ARL.

MR. BUDINGTON: The charge of our task force was to consider criteria for ARL membership for nonuniversity groups and agencies that support research library interests.

In the by-laws of the Association, it does say that in general, member institutions are, I believe, major university libraries whose collections and services are broadly based, and certain other libraries whose collections are recognized as having national significance. Now the quantitative criteria, which has been applied to candidates for university library membership are not, of course, all of them applicable to the nonuniversity group, the public libraries or to the individual research libraries.

Our task force met twice; it considered the various kinds of nonacademic libraries which had been brought to our attention for consideration in this respect. These included multicampus agencies such as the one at the University of California. This includes agencies, such as the Council on Library Resources, which are oriented to and supportive of research library interests, but are not libraries. These may also include the networks which are coming into existence -- RLG, as well as the independent research libraries and the public libraries. We had considerable discussion regarding the extent to which we felt each of the groups or entities should be considered as candidates for membership in ARL. Our preliminary report, which was presented to the Board, discussed progress and conditions in respect to each of these groups; and while we did come to certain conclusions tentatively with respect to the independent research libraries, we considered them in the context of the other association, the Independent Research Libraries Association, whose criteria were derived from ARL and whose criteria we now propose to use as our very own in some respects. The consideration of groups like RLG, and FAUL, we considered in the light of their inclusion of not only nonARL members, but ARL members, and how that might influence their eligibility for membership. Finally, to what extent do the multicampus agencies, such as the University of California entity, bear on and represent the interests of ARL itself?

As Page Ackerman said, the final recommendations have not been arrived at, and we are directing a report from our task force along with that of Ms. Ackerman's group to the membership within a few weeks. We do want your feelings on these various items. When you read through the reports, you will get a little flavor of what some of the discussion has been. So we will indeed welcome your feedback on this, and hopefully will come up with some meaningful results which do not necessarily bear entirely on quantitative measures, although, as has been said, this is all we have at the present time. We hope to have somewhat of a tuneful duet prepared for you next fall.

MR. ROUSE: I have a question in regard to Ms. Ackerman's report. Does criteria nine have to do with Ph.D degrees?

MS. ACKERMAN: There are two criteria that have to do with Ph.D's: number nine and number ten. Number nine has to do with simply the gross number of Ph.D degrees awarded; the minimum requirement is 30 percent of the median. That was reduced from 40 percent to 30 percent last year. Number ten is the number of Ph.D degree programs approved in all fields, and at this point, we feel two things: one, that those two criteria represent the efforts that were made to approach the problem of quality. We feel that the problem of quality needs to be approached in much broader ways; and two, we feel as of now, anyway, that criteria number nine is really redundant, and that number ten suffices. Number ten is the number of fields in which Ph.D degrees are granted, and the requirement there is 40 percent of the median. This whole matter was discussed back at the 83rd ARL meeting. That recommendation to delete number nine was made at that time, and I might add, was defeated then by the membership. We feel now that the situation has changed and we really support the original recommendation as of now.

MR. ROUSE: I just have the feeling that the number of Ph.D degrees has more to do with quality than some of the others.

MS. ACKERMAN: That is what I would hope that we would hear. We are aware that this is a controversial issue, and we will try to give you our reasoning in the record and hope that we will get a response from you.

* * * *

ARL/ACRL Committee on University Library Standards

MS. WHITNEY: Another group that has been wrestling with quality versus quantity is the University Library Standards Committee, and I would like Eldred Smith to report on its work.

MR. SMITH: I have a very brief report. The committee is a joint committee; it is composed of and has been charged by both ARL and ACRL. It was established at the end of the last calendar year, and is charged to develop university library standards for review, and hopefully approval by the two parent organization. The committee includes the following members, in addition to myself: Calvin Boyer, William Kurth, Stanley McElderry, Richard Talbot, Melvin Voigt, and Roy Watkins.

We have met twice. We met first rather briefly at ALA mid-winter, simply to lay out a general plan of attack and to try to establish a timetable for ourselves. We had our first working session yesterday, which I personally thought was quite productive. It is our hope that we will have draft standards for presentation to and consideration by both ARL and ACRL by the end of this calendar year. The one accomplishment so far is that we have managed, largely through the help of Beverly Lynch, to secure some modest outside funding with receipt of the Morris Jones Award.

* * * *

ARL/CRL Committee on a National Periodicals Lending Library

MR. BRYANT: The ARL-CRL Joint Committee on the National Periodicals Library was appointed by its two parent organizations late last autumn. I might remind you of the membership: its consists of Richard De Gennaro, vice chairman; Warren Haas; Arthur Hamlin; Stephen McCarthy, representing the Council on Library Resources; John McDonald; Robert Wessel, who is president of the Center for Research Libraries, formerly provost at the University of Cincinnati; Virginia Whitney; and Gordon Williams. This committee was appointed and established as a consequence of earlier action by the ARL membership, specifically as of the May, 1975 meeting, where the membership endorsed the report of the ARL Task Force on a National Periodicals Resource Plan, which called for the establishment of a national periodicals lending library.

Members will recall also the report by Vernon Palmer and others which was published by the Association in February of 1974, and which advocated the creation of the national facility for checking and disseminating periodical literature. Now, almost simultaneous with the establishment of this joint committee was the establishment of the NCLIS task force on a national journals system. I underline the word "system." On this National Commission task force, there are four members, who are also members of the ARL-CRL joint committee, so there is a broad spectrum of interrelationship here, which is a very important aspect of it. The task force has been discussing a wide variety of components of such a system, which involves the capability of providing on a national basis reliable access to periodical literature, in which the notion of a library dedicated to providing journal articles across the country may be a major element.

The joint committee prepared a progress report which was submitted to the National Commission prior to its second meeting on April 5th. The progress report from the joint committee went to the National Commission with covering letters from the presidents of the two parent organizations, ARL and CRL, after action by the full boards of each of these bodies. The progress report of the joint committee was on the agenda for the April 5th meeting of the task force and was considered at that time. I may say that these three documents, that is to say, the two covering letters and the report itself, will be made a part of the minutes of this session of the ARL convention, and thus in due course, available to all of you. [The material referred to here is included as Appendix D (1-3) of these Minutes].

The joint committee report proposes that a national facility be established, a national facility dedicated to this purpose. Such a facility might well be in addition to various kinds of local organization services now in existence or later to be created. It is the joint committee's recommendation that such a national center might well be formed out of the Center for Research Libraries current collection and services. An essential element in this, of course, would be a basic reconstruction or reconstitution of the Center for Research Libraries, both as to governance, as to organization, and clearly a reconstitution that would envisage a non-membership kind of organization with its services and facilities available to readers everywhere.

Now what about the next steps? The National Commission task force, which is chaired by Alphonse Trezza, will hold its next meeting on June 11th; it is the hope of all of us involved with the task force that at that session we can arrive at a consensus on the general framework of a national capability for the provision of journal literature to students and scholars across the nation. The joint committee is working actively. I hope to have a good deal more to report to the Association at our meeting in October. There are, at the present time and in the course of the last six months, a number of circumstances which allow me at least a degree of optimism that at very long last our vision of so very many years may at last become realizable.

* * * *

Office of University Library Management Studies

MR. WEBSTER: I might review briefly the several activities of the Office of University Library Management Studies in relation to two types of priorities: the operating program priorities and secondly, the developmental project priorities. You know that during several years of Office operations, we have been involved in a number of activities that involved a basic operating requirement on the part of the Office. The Management Review and Analysis

Program (MRAP) is one of these programs. Currently we are in the process of operating the fifth application of MRAP at Johns Hopkins University libraries, and we expect that the study team there will have a report out of that project sometime this summer. The earlier (fourth) application is in its final stages. We have reports from three of the participating libraries, and the remainder of those libraries expect to have their reports also by summer.

In terms of future directions for MRAP, we are anticipating an application this next year. There are two libraries that have indicated an interest in working through MRAP, so I suspect that we will probably operate that self-study project as an institutional project at these organizations. That is to say, rather than working with a group of libraries in that self-study activity, we will focus on individual institutions, with training sessions and assistance provided directly by the Office to the participating library.

Regarding a second area of OMS activitity, the Systems and Procedures Exchange Center, I think as you have seen, SPEC products are accumulating. We have now 25 flyers and kits that have been issued by the Center. As you recall, this Center is an attempt to gather information on current practices in research libraries and to make available documentation on these practices to other libraries. Topical focus of this center goes beyond management topics per se. We have attempted to not be constrained with the management label, but instead, to look at a number of issues or problems and to collect information on how research libraries are dealing with those problems and then make them available through the Center.

I think the last several SPEC flyers and kits illustrate this quite clearly. On the basis of a SPEC survey covering public service activities in research libraries, we issued a flyer on user statistics, a flyer on user studies, and this month we are putting out a flyer on bibliographic access services. We do expect during the course of the year to put out ten different flyers and associated kits.

In another area, I think the training program has emerged as one of the major interests and priorities of the OMS. Last year's Management Skills Institute was assessed as being a relatively successful event and has prompted the Office to plan three additional institutes for this year. The first institute at Airlie House will be in July, and we have already a little over 50 percent of that institute subscribed to. The second institute is going to take place at Stanford, and in that setting we have arranged with Stanford University libraries to provide the facilities for the institute. We are conducting a public institute there the third week in September. Following that public institute we have arranged to conduct a management skills institute for select members of the Stanford staff themselves, and the idea here is that we can provide the institute in this sort of cooperative arrangement in a much more economical fashion than we could if Stanford had to subscribe to the full price of the institute.

Other training activities that we have been involved in include the training film program. We have acquired several additional films and have found that the use of this service is increasing significantly.

The McGill project, which we have talked about a little before, is in its operating stage at this point. The performance appraisal training materials were developed, again in cooperation with McGill, and the McGill staff are now actually applying these in the library. In summary our three major priorities in the operating programs include MRAP, SPEC, and this whole area of training.

In terms of developmental priorities, we have a number of projects that are in various stages of evolution. One of them I think we have mentioned before is called the problem analysis project. The attempt here is to design a methodology for identifying and resolving problems in a research library setting. The first package in this area is focusing on collection development. We have outlined that and we are now looking at the next stages in the design of some sort of pilot test for that technique.

A second project that we are involved in is this services development project on which we have conducted the SPEC survey and which I mentioned earlier. We have so far issued three SPEC flyers on this. We are now looking again with the Management Commission toward the next steps we might take with that project.

We are also rather heavily involved in working on the Academic Library Development Program. The Council on Library Resources has funded the project at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte in order to design a self-study procedure that would be of some value as a tool to be applied in small and middle-sized academic libraries. That project has been underway during the last six months, and we look for the initial stages to be completed by this summer.

Another area that we are working on is a project that is aimed at designing training materials for supervisors in research libraries. We have, on the basis of some of the work we have done with McGill and some of the work we have done within the MRAP process, been able to outline four modules to date: one on leadership style, one on decision making, one on goal setting, and one on the management and use of time. We expect to be able to move ahead with those training materials and possibly have them ready for testing and application during the latter part of this year.

I mention these several developmental projects, because I think we will be looking to the members for help in testing those activities and for assistance in assessing their value, their importance, their usefulness to you; and I think in line with that, the OMS staff are very interested in any comments or suggestions you might have for us in helping refine and develop these activities. As mentioned by Ralph Hopp, we are now at a point where the Office will be establishing a new advisory structure, and your comments and suggestions in that respect would be useful to us.

* * * *

Report of the Executive Director

MR. McDONALD: Some of you may have had the impression that last Fall's meeting was going to be my last as executive director. To anyone who is disappointed to find me still around, I want to make the following promise: that at the conclusion of tomorrow's board meeting, I plan to disappear fully and finally.

Therefore, as befits a dedicated birdwatcher such as myself, this is going to be my swan song. All intelligent people know that there are three species of swans in North America: the trumpeter swan, the whistling swan, and the mute swan. Which one of these I should choose to be on this occasion gave me considerable problem. I was almost equally tempted by the mute swan and the trumpeter swan, but I have chosen the middle one, and I mean to imitate the whistling swan, whose song is short and sweet.

I want to begin what might laughingly be called a report with what is properly its conclusion. I do so because, like that good man William Welsh, I sometimes get emotional on occasions such as this, and I want to get said what is in my mind. I think you can guess what that is: namely, that it has been a great privilege for me to have had the opportunity to serve as executive director of the Association of Research Libraries, even if briefly. Some of you may feel that it has not been brief enough. But this is truly a great organization, with a great record of accomplishment. I am positive it has a great future.

I would like to think that I have not done it any great harm during my 18 months here, as some of you have been kind enough to write to me or speak with me and say that you think that I may have even done some good. To those people, I obviously want to express my sincere thanks, and I want to say to those people also that it has really been easy, given the quality of the ARL staff and the caliber of people with whom I have had the opportunity to work: the officers of the Association, the members of the Board of Directors, and all of you, who, I think, contribute so very much to the ARL out of its long tradition of volunteerism. I am really more grateful to you than I possible say here and that is really all I want to say at this point. I know you know what is in my heart.

Having said the last first, let me get down to business and try to tell you a little bit about some of the things that we have done in the seven or so months since I last reported to you. Just after the October meeting of the Association, I traveled to Japan to represent the ARL at the Third Japan-U.S. Library Conference where I read a brief paper on the subject of standards for university libraries. A number of ARL directors also delivered papers at that meeting. While I think it is difficult to gauge the effect or the value of such a bi-national conference, I would have to believe that it is the sort of thing that is worth doing from time to time.

Soon after my return from Japan, there began a series of meetings on copyright, which grew in frequency and intensity as the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, Civil Liberties and the Administration of Justice neared the completion of its hearings and prepared to mark up the copyright revision bill. Copyright has certainly been the overriding concern I have had over the last several months since our meeting, and after the turn of the year, it occupied virtually all of my time, which, I think, in part explains why we have failed to follow our normal schedule in communicating with you through the ARL Newsletter. I am sure that the staff will do a lot better in the future.

I am going to come back to copyright in a few minutes. Just now, I want to say a few words about the ARL office and its two projects. I gave a fairly full report at the annual meeting in the fall on our finances, which were better than you wanted them to be. You know you instructed us to do a little deficit spending, and I have failed you again. We keep accumulating a modest reserve, but maybe John Lorenz can do better. We now have 104 members, as Virginia Whitney indicated to you at the top of the show. Our first quarter expenditures are very much on our budgeted target, and a full auditors'report will be included in the next minutes of the Association meeting, so that you can be able to see in black and white what I am reporting here.

Mr. Webster has given you a very good report on the activities of the Office of Management Studies, and I will not add to that, except to say that they are in their first year of their Council on Library Resources grant.

As far as the Center for Chinese Research Materials is concerned, I am delighted that P.K. Yu could be here and visit with some of you at the meeting. The Center continues its excellent work. As you know, it is operating, unlike the ARL, in a deficit posture. We continue to have strong assurances from the State Department that they will, at least for the current year, be able to repair that deficit. The Center has a revolving fund on which they can draw as well, but we are very much concerned to remedy this shortfall. P.K. Yu is readying proposals for funding agencies, which I think is very great promise for success. I had hoped very much before I left Washington last week to be able to have the final assurance from the State Department. I do think that very soon they will be sending us some supplementary funding for the CCRM. Its reputation is superb around the country, and I can not help but believe that it will succeed in securing the necessary funding.

I shared this and other information with the Board yesterday. I think since this is an interim report, I am not going to try to dwell on all of the things that I shared with the Board. The Board minutes will be sent to you in due course. I would simply like to say that the office has made the best effort it could to continue their good relations with the NCLIS and Mr. Trezza, with the Library of Congress, and with others with whom we work with such frequency.

We have a fairly good publication record, other than the Newsletter, since we were able to get out the promised separate on the Library of Congress as a National Bibliographic Center. I must say that I feel much comforted by some of the most recent events that have occurred in Washington. I rather dreaded leaving the Washington scene with no visible accomplishments, and I am not sure that the ones I am going to cite are all that tangible, but at least I can leave feeling that there are some prospects for accomplishments.

Now, first on the copyright front, just about a month ago the House Subcommittee finally reached in its markup the famous Subsection 108(g) (2) on library photocopying. Subsequent to its action, I sent what I called a copyright update. As you know, the Subcommittee adopted an amendment to the section which changes the language which this association and others have objected to so strongly. We feel that it changes the language in a direction which is helpful to us, and it was that influence that I was trying to share with you. I put my own interpretation on the meaning of that language, and since I am not an attorney, I could be very wrong. Some of you have noticed that that language is vague, perhaps ambiguous, but I hope it is not permanently troublesome.

Since the copyright memo I sent you, I have taken some additional actions. We have secured from our attorneys their official legal interpretation of the new language for 108(g) (2). Recently we have secured from them some suggested language for the House report, which will accompany the bill once it is passed. It is important for us to have in the House report suggested language which provides needed interpretation of the amendment. Philip Brown, our attorney, has done an admirable job in providing possible report language. That language I think we will be able to share after we have had a chance to read it, adjust it, and discuss it within the staff. It is very important that we take comfort from what has been accomplished, and at the same time not congratulate ourselves prematurely. There will be other hurdles. The bill will eventually be voted on in toto by the committee, and it is even possible at that late time that another amendment can be brought forward. Assuming it is passed, and 108(g) (2) remains as it is in its present version, it will go to the House floor, where of course it could also be amended. Assuming it passes there in its present form, it needs to go to a conference committee of the Senate and the House, as the Senate version differs. There, we would hope to be able to have the conference committee adhere to the House language, and I think we have some reason to be optimistic on that score.

The amendment has good auspices. It was passed with only one dissenting vote by the House Subcommittee. Its drafting by the committee staff gives it strength. We feel that the Register of Copyrights is not out of sympathy with the amendment. Very important, we believe that the amendment has a very good chance of standing up in conference. The publishers have not had a great deal to say about the amendment as yet, but what they have said I think has been in a friendly or certainly not an unfriendly spirit, so that, again, I think this gives us some reason for optimism.

Throughout all this, we have had the great benefit of a powerful coalition of library associations, and I certainly want to recognize the indebtedness to the ALA and the other associations for their efforts that they have put into this along with us. I think Robert Wedgeworth can testify that it is a demanding process, but we stuck together, we worked together, and I think for that reason and others we accomplished something. I do not want to overlook the effort of the communications from all of you. The Subcommittee staff noted the unprecedented volume of mail that accompanied this issue, and I know from the carbon copies that you sent to the ARL office that many of you wrote long and persuasive letters. It was an impressive accomplishment from ARL and its members. Toward the end more and more users and user groups were heard from, including scholarly societies and others. This certainly helped. I think without this, we would have been very unlikely to secure an amendment in the House. Their tendency was to go along with the Senate version wherever possible.

As I understand it the associations have agreed to have another joint meeting soon, and although I will not be a party to that, I am delighted that the coalition will continue. I certainly will be glad to answer questions later from any of you who wish to put them to me, but I think that is enough for the moment on the copyright matter.

I want to talk now about another possible accomplishment. This is an amendment to the Higher Education Act, which provides new language for Title II-C. As you know, Title II-C once served as the vehicle for the shared cataloging program, which has now become a part of the annual budget of the Library of Congress, and it is moving very effectively along in that way. Title II-C remains as kind of an empty vessel into which we have poured some new language. Again, I think that the amendment that we have succeeded in securing from the Senate Subcommittee on Education is one that has the best efforts of not just the ARL, but also the ALA, and others. This amendment, if agreed to ultimately in a conference committee with the House, would provide the funding for research libraries, libraries of the type represented in this association, but in addition, in states where there is no ARL library, the largest academic library or the largest public library or the state library agency.

Even though the funding requested in the first year is modest by Federal standards (I am talking about $10,000,000 when I say modest), it could be the start of a new program of library support that could have far-reaching significance. In recent days, and I mean just last week, we are considering the possibility of a slight change in the wording of the new language for HEA II-C in order to make it possible for a resource sharing agency to secure funding under this title. This hopefully would speak possibly to the needs of the NCLIS and its task force effort on a national serials system. It would respond to the initiatives of the ARL that you have already heard about from Douglas Bryant, reporting for the ARL-CRL joint committee, and possibly to other resource sharing agencies that might be in a position to provide a national service in return for Federal support.

I have discussed this with Robert Wedgeworth and others. I know it has been discussed with Alphonse Trezza, although he and I have not had a chance to talk about it too recently, but Mr. Trezza knows about it and I think approves. We have some assurances from Senator Pell's committee that it will not be too difficult to secure this change in the language, and we are very hopeful that that, too, can be done. It might be from the ARL view, promoting one of the long standing and high priorities that we attach to the establishment of some sort of a national lending library.

I would like to turn now to a Board action which is in some way related to what I have just talked about, and that is a reaffirmation of the charge to our Interlibrary Loan Committee. There was reference in our meeting this morning to the necessity to look at the growing tendency in ARL libraries and others to charge for various services. The practice of charging for interlibrary loans is one that is growing, and it seemed to the Board that it would be timely to try to find out what is happening, and to be in a position to advise the Association on this front. To that end, the Board reaffirmed the need to take a broad view of Association interests regarding interlibrary loan, and requested the Committee to investigate the consequences of interlibrary loan charges, including implications of the proposed copyright issues and the proposed use of coupons. In order to do so, the Board agreed that the Committee membership should be increased from five to seven members. David Weber, who has served very effectively as the chairman of the Interlibrary Loan Committee has asked to be relieved of the chairmanship, but has agreed to remain on the Committee. We are fortunate in being able to say that Jay Lucker, who has been serving on the Committee, has agreed to become chairman, so there will be continuity in the activities of the Interlibrary Loan Committee: it does have an important task to perform.

There are a number of other matters that I think are somewhat less significant, and I do not believe I am going to take the time to go into them. I am beginning to anticipate that boat ride and salmon bake, and I do not want to keep you here too long; but I do certainly want to say in closing that I am delighted that the Association has found a person of John Lorenz's experience and ability to succeed me as executive director. John has already begun to work for the Association, and his capable and judicious approach is, I think what is going to serve the Association extremely well in the years ahead. As a prospective member of the Association, I look forward to working with him and you in the future. Thank you.

* * * *

MRS. WHITNEY: John McDonald has not only given you, as usual, a very beautiful and full report of the executive director, but he took away from me the opportunity of doing more than asking you to join me in a very heartfelt thanks for the splendid way he served us. I can not believe it is only 18 months; it seems as if John has always been with us. You have listened to people in my position frequently say how worried they are about being able to fulfill the requirements of the office of ARL presidency. I have learned something. With the executive director's help and the staff in the office, it is not so bad. I would like to give the members of the Search Committee some credit, because they worked exceedingly quickly and came up with a unanimous recommendation. The Search Committee was chaired by Richard De Gennaro and included William Budington, Rutherford Rogers, Warren Haas, and Ralph Hopp. They presented a unanimous recommendation to the Board, which was unanimously accepted by the Board, and the board empowered the Executive Committee to offer the appointment of executive director to John Lorenz. We could not have been happier with his acceptance. Then the two Johns got together and we presently have two executive directors to work with. One is going to be relieved tomorrow after the Board meeting; the other has just recently assumed an official position with us as of the 1st of May. In actuality, both men have been working hand in glove all spring, so we have a very effective transition from one to the other. They will continue to consult with one another, and fortunately for all of us, while we know John McDonald is going to Connecticut, he is still one of us and we will be able to call on him, as we wish him good luck in his new responsibilities at Connecticut.

It is now my pleasure to turn to John Lorenz, whom I am happy to introduce as your new executive director. He would like to say a few words to you.

MR. LORENZ: Thank you very much, Virginia. I also wanted to thank you for your letters of congratulations and best wishes and offers of cooperation. I think John McDonald would agree that any executive director needs all the cooperation and understanding he can get. There was one letter in particular, with a particular paragraph that really struck me; and I would like to share it with you. I have the approval of the writer to do this anonymously. He said, "Twould be madness to promise that I will suddenly become a paragon of positive thinking and cooperation, but I am certainly willing to try." I hail that as a major breakthrough; that is the spirit. I would agree with John McDonald, that this is a great Association, and I am fortunate to have had the opportunity of working with it the last 10 years. It does have a remarkable record of achievement and tradition, of good will and cooperation, and I want to do everything I possibly can to carry on those traditions.

I believe there is a great deal of strength in this Association, and I think the record shows this. Just recalling a couple of examples, it seems to me getting libraries included under PL 480, getting the National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging all the way through the Congress against some rather severe opposition -- and I remember it because I was in the Office of Education at that time -- that was a tremendous achievement. I think those two things alone have put ARL into bibliographic and cultural history. It would seem to me that some of the recent achievements, such as turning around the Kastenmeier Subcommittee as a result of the many communications from members, getting HEA Title II-C written into the Senate bill on the extension of the Higher Education Act. I think there are tremendous opportunities in that Title II-C because for the first time the unique contributions that research libraries make in the development of a national library and information system has been recognized. A lot of hard work will have to be done to get that all the way through, but I think there are great opportunities in working toward those ends.

So, I want to do everything that I can to forward these interests of ARL. I will be looking to the Board; I will be looking to the membership. I will be looking to the staff and I would agree with John that it is an excellent staff that we begin with. I do not think I want to go any further into the future of the Association at this time, but I do want to say that I am delighted to have an opportunity to be working with all of you in this capacity. Thank you very much.

* * * *

APPENDIX A

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE TO STUDY THE ARL COMMISSION STRUCTURE

Task Force Charge: To analyze the scope and inter-relationship of the Commissions and the problems they have in fulfilling their responsibilities; also to consider the role of the ARL Board in relation to the Commissions.

Recommendations:

1. The Board of Directors and the ARL staff should assume the responsibilities presently assigned to the various Commissions, with the exception of the Management Commission.
2. In place of the Commission on Management of Research Libraries, a standing Advisory Committee to the Office of Management Studies should be created, with appropriate representative from the Board, the membership, and others as may prove useful for the OMS program.
3. The Commission structure of the ARL should be eliminated.

Background Information on the Commissions

The Commission structure was first outlined in a March 29, 1971 "draft report" to the Board by President Thomas R. Buckman. In that report he identified the major areas of concern and activity of the ARL and arranged these under "Task Groups." These "Groups" were given titles essentially in use today: Development of Resources, Organization of Resources, Access to Resources and Service to Readers, Management of Research Libraries, Relationships with the Federal Government, and Association Affairs (Executive Committee). This "new form" of ARL operation placed all committees within one of the Task Groups in a heirarchical fashion, thus removing the direct oversight responsibility of the Committees from the Executive Director. The "Groups" were named Commissions rather than Task Groups and the plan was then implemented by the Board.

After some two years of operation under this method of organization, it seemed apparent that the interposing of Commissions between the working committees and the Executive Director, while perhaps relieving the Executive Director of much of the time-consuming responsibilities, also placed him in the position of not having first-hand information on many Association affairs. The Commission chairmen regularly met in one session with the Board and also reported to the membership, alternatively in written and oral form. After experience of some two years in this mode it became clear that the organization was not functioning satisfactorily.

On November 19, 1973 the Commission chairmen, ARL staff, and the Executive Committee, met to reconsider the Commission structure. That meeting resulted in placing the management of the Commissions more directly within the Board, with Board members serving as chairmen. Also, the Commissions were given only advisory responsibilities to the Board rather than management of the various committees. Committees again were placed directly under the Executive Director and ARL Office staff for coordination. In addition, Task Forces for specifically identified concerns were established.

The Commission chairmen and the Board, in their continuous review of issues and priorities of ARL, often found that many matters were of interest to, and fell within the purview of, more than one Commission. The membership appeared not to understand the Commission structure, a fact that became quite apparent at the May 1975 membership discussion session.

To take yet another look at the Commission structure, President De Gennaro appointed the present Task Force on June 9, 1975. Meanwhile the Commissioners, also trying to resolve the overlapping areas of responsibility, requested another joint meeting, which subsequently was held on December 10, 1975. At that meeting a calendar of issues was identified and some effort was made to bring these down to a few top priority concerns. Also, responsibility for these was then placed within the individual commissions and the ARL Office staff.

Comments on the Recommendations

> Recommendation No. 1: The Board of Directors and the ARL Staff should assume the responsibilities presently assigned to the various Commissions, with the exception of the Management Commission.

As presently functioning the Commissions have as their responsibility "identifying broad issues and concerns, setting objectives, providing state-of-the-art analyses and assessment of future directions for ARL" (November 22, 1973 report by S. Frankie). Although the Commission chairmen are members of the Board, these responsibilities we believe are the proper function of the Board as a whole, particularly those relating to "setting objectives" and "assessment of future directions for ARL."

For the Board to take on (back) these responsibilities it may very well consider several suggestions which the Task Force discussed.

1. The Board may have to meet more often if it is to expand its responsibilities, as suggested.

2. As an alternative, or even perhaps including the above, the Board may want to extend its meeting period to an additional day each time.

3. The meetings of the Board may be more appropriately directed toward priority concerns and action matters (instead of as much time as is now given to informational-type items).

4. In order to take on the functions of the Commissions the Board might want to consider expanding its membership by several people and then forming sub-groups of Board members focusing attention to specific areas similar to those now identified by the present Commission delineation. These sub-groups would generate recommendations to be considered by the Board as a whole.

For the ARL Office staff to discharge its proper function, the Task Force feels strongly that this staff has to be augmented. At the December 10, 1975 meeting of the Commissioners, among the high priority issues identified, there were clearly several areas in which the staff has to take primary responsibility. It is not only impractical but probably unrealistic, given the size of ARL membership, for any except the small number of members serving on the Board or specific Task Forces, to participate very effectively in ARL affairs. Further, it undoubtedly is an expectation among the membership that the ARL staff has to provide the major leadership and thrust on such matters as federal legislation, liaison with governmental and educational agencies, research, and communication among the membership. At the May 1975 membership discussion meeting at Houston, it was clear that membership expects more from the ARL staff than the present size could possibly provide. Also, many members were very surprised at the smallness of the staff, and expansion, even with the implication of higher dues, was a commonly expressed suggestion.

Recommendation No. 2: In place of the Commission on Management of Research Libraries, a standing Advisory Committee to the Office of Management Studies should be created, with appropriate representation from the Board, the membership, and others as may prove useful for the OMS program.

In some respects this would refine present practice and properly label the Management Commission. The OMS is a special program requiring an advisory group that has continuity, specific interest and/or skills in management matters, and should be under the chairmanship of someone chosen for reasons other than simply Board membership. The Board, however, should have representation on the Advisory Committee for liaison purposes. Membership on the Committee should not necessarily be limited to ARL membership although we believe a majority of the Committee members should be from among the membership. The Executive Director should be an ex officio member of the Committee.

In connection with OMS, the Task Force believes that the OMS staff increasingly should be available and drawn upon, in a supportive way, for ARL staff responsibilities, particularly in areas involving statistics, planning, research, and economic concerns. Its assistance in drafting research or project proposals, for example, appropriately could result in the development of techniques and guidelines of use to the membership in a more general way.

Recommendation No. 3: The Commission structure of the ARL should be eliminated.

From the above brief background of the Commission structure, it becomes apparent that this pattern of operations, while possessing a certain logic, has not been effective in practice. No attempt has been made to analyze, in any thorough fashion, why this has been the ARL experience. Suffice to observe that in its brief (5 year) existence, the Commission structure has been under almost continuous review (and attack). If there are proponents of the structure, the Task Force has not heard of them. Obviously some change is called for.

The Task Force, which is making this recommendation, consists of a current Board member, a past Board member, a past Commission Chairman, a past President, and a young ARL member. In addition, the final meeting of the Task Force was attended by the ARL Executive Director and the Executive Director-designate. We humbly ask to be discharged, having met what we interpreted to be our charge.

Ray Frantz, Jr.
W. David Laird
Stanley McElderry
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Ralph H. Hopp, Chairman

January 27, 1976

* * * *

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE TO REVIEW CRITERIA FOR ARL MEMBERSHIP

Establishment

At the 45th ARL Board meeting, May 7, 1975, discussion of specific problems created by Membership Criteria #9 (number of Ph.D degrees granted) led to the appointment of this Subcommittee. The Subcommittee was asked to review all of the criteria for ARL membership, to consider the relationship of these criteria to the proposed Standards for University Libraries and to the work of the recently-created Task Force on Criteria for ARL Membership for Non-University Libraries and for Non-Library Agencies, chaired by William Budington.

Procedure

During the 87th ARL meeting in Washington, October 1975, the Subcommittee met once as a body and once with the Task Force. Otherwise its deliberations have been carried on by mail or by telephone. After October 1975, all written communications were shared with members of the Task Force.

Eligibility For Membership

The Subcommittee first asked itself whether Article II, Section I of the ARL By-Laws, which describes in general terms the institutions eligible for membership as "major university libraries whose collections and services are broadly based and...certain other libraries whose collections are recognized as having national significance...," should continue to be the basis for the development of membership criteria. We concluded that: (1) ARL should continue to be an association of academic and non-academic institutions which maintain collections of national research significance and (2) that the primary objective of the membership criteria is to identify such institutions.

Appropriateness of Present Criteria

Criteria #9 (Number of Ph.D.'s Granted)

In considering the appropriateness of the present criteria for this task as they apply to academic libraries, we first addressed the specific problem of Criteria #9. We asked ourselves if the present requirement on the number of Ph.D.'s granted helps to differentiate between institutions in a special and significant way. The Committee reviewed the history of Criteria #9 which covers several years and found itself in agreement with the Rovelstad Committee on Membership Criteria which recommended at the January 1974 ARL membership meeting that the requirement be dropped. The recommendation was defeated. At that time the Rovelstad Committee argued: (1) that the requirement caused difficulties for several promising potential candidates because it was skewed upward by the number of Ph.D.'s granted by a few very large institutions.

(Membership pointed out, correctly, that the required percentage of the median was flexible and could be lowered, as it eventually was, from 40% to 30%.) (2) That the number of fields in which a library has been judged by accrediting agencies and by its own institution to be qualified to support Ph.D. programs is the statistic most relevant to a judgment on the breadth of collections. The Subcommittee agrees and believes Criteria #9 to be redundant. We therefore recommend that Criteria #9 be dropped as a requirement for membership in ARL.

Size/Significance (Quality)

We have carefully reviewed as a whole the criteria for membership in the light of the increasing concern among librarians, educators, legislators, and administrators with the long range implications of exponential growth which has led to increasing local, regional and national emphasis on resource sharing. We also had in mind the more generalized but equally current emphasis on quality and focus in education. We do not believe that the present criteria provide the best possible direct measure of research collections of high quality. While they are easily derived from statistics now collected by ARL, they represent miscellaneous descriptive information collected over time which is primarily oriented to budget applications and useful for management purposes. With the possible exception of Criteria #10, they tell us how big but not how good nor how significant unless we continue to accept the implicit assumption that biggest is best. Although we are acutely aware of the difficulty of expressing quality in any terms, quantitative or subjective, we are convinced that in the present environment it is important for ARL to approach management information and membership criteria as separate problems and to make a major effort to develop more direct measures of the quality of collections and services as a basis for membership. We therefore recommend:

a. That before the close of the October meeting, ARL appoint a Membership Criteria Task Force to continue the unfinished work of the two groups now concerning themselves with membership criteria.

b. That the Task Force be asked to revise membership criteria for all types of research institutions recognizing specifically the need to emphasize quality as well as quantity as a requirement, using the following guidelines insofar as they appear productive.

Guidelines

1. The definition of the collection should include all forms of material of research significance (esp. microforms and manuscripts.

2. The collection should be described by a standardized set of subjects (e.g. major LC categories, HEGIS fields or other methods).

3. The measure applied to fields of collection should be by titles held and titles added, supplemented by a statement of acquisitions policy.

4. Unique holdings should be identified by a brief narrative description (i.e. some materials such as pictures, broadsides, etc. are not readily quantifiable).

5. Quality of services should be measured in terms of national dependence (i.e. ratio of loans to borrowing, including photocopy).

6. Quality of access should be measured in terms of the number of service staff; bibliographic access should be assumed unless there are unique tools that can be identified.

c. That in view of the importance of data gathering and analysis in the work of the Task Force, the person directing the compilation of ARL Statistics be an ex-officio member.

d. That in view of the importance and difficulty of the Task Force's mission, the Executive Director be authorized to make funds available for the support of special studies within reasonable limits.

Relationship with Task Force on Criteria for ARL Membership For Non-University Libraries and Non-Library Agencies

Since October 1975, the Subcommittee and the Task Force have shared documents. We are agreed in principle that a continuing effort to revise the quantitative ARL membership criteria is needed and that the effort should be carried on by a single committee after action at the October meeting on our specific recommendations.

Relationship Between Activities of the ARL/ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards

The work of the Joint Committee began after the ALA Midwinter Meeting in January 1976. If the Board concurs with the recommendations in this repo it will be forwarded for information to the Chairman of the Joint Committee. The Subcommittee recommends that there be a continuing liaison between the Joint Committee, the present Subcommittee and the proposed Task Force.

Gustave Harrer
Stanley McElderry
Page Ackerman, Chairman

April 24, 1976

* * * *

APPENDIX C

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON CRITERIA FOR ARL MEMBERSHIP FOR NON-UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES AND NON-LIBRARY AGENCIES

The present report essentially repeats the conclusions presented to the Board of Directors at its October, 1975, meeting. Since preparation of the report, the Task Force has met with the Board's Subcommittee on Criteria for ARL Membership at the October, 1975, membership meeting; the two Chairpersons have also conferred, at the ALA Midwinter Meeting and by telephone, to coordinate the thinking of the two groups and obtain a modicum of interaction.

Both groups have attempted to consider both short-term and long-term considerations and proposals for changes in criteria for admission to ARL membership. There is substantial agreement that, in the long-term, parameters must be better developed for the exercise of qualitative judgment. For the short term, our best effort must be directed toward honoring our quantitative measures to the most relevant statistics. Although the specific element is not meaningful in its own area of charge, the Task Force supports the Subcommittee's recommendation to drop the number of Ph.D.'s conferred as a membership criterion.

In its deliberations, the Task Force reached one conclusion which it refers to the Board as a basic premise: that, at least for the time being, ARL should remain an association of libraries (i.e., their institutions) directly involved in developing their own collections and in serving scholars. (This rationale is understood to be central to Subcommittee thinking as well.) In light of this conclusion, the Task Force recommends that non-library agencies not be considered for full membership at the present time. This determination applies to such multi-campus entities as the University of California, Executive Director of University-wide Library Planning, and the CUNY top-level coordinative position. These are felt to serve largely an "internal" function rather than integrative function, between fully independent entities. The determination also applies to organizations such as the Council on Library Resources, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, etc. As funding agencies, a conceivable conflict of interest would be likely; in addition, their interests are so broad as not solely to focus on matters which are of concern to large research libraries.

The premise stated at the head of the preceding paragraph does, however, lead to two categories in which membership is felt to be appropriate:

a. Library Groups - Suggested in this category have been library consortia (e.g., RLG, FAUL) and library networks (e.g., NELINET, SOLINET). There are, most certainly, associated groups whose objectives are similar or even identical to those of ARL, whose influence and expertise in the management of group activities are of key interest and concern to the ARL membership. Yet full membership for such groups is not the present recommendation. Rather it is concluded that an Associate Membership is appropriate, carrying no dues, no vote, and no eligibility for elective office, but with the right of the floor in all discussions, and the obligation to serve in appointive capacities. Some criteria for admission would be:

1. All members of the group or consortia must be ARL members.

2. The group or consortia must be well organized, with full-time professional secretariat.

The underlying rationale is that to a major and even exclusive extent, the group is engaged in activities significant to ARL goals and objectives. Those groups having non-ARL members are likely to focus on many matters of little concern to ARL and would tend to dilute, to some great or small degree, the energies of the total ARL effort. Should such non-members later qualify and become ARL members, then the group would be considered for a candidacy.

b. Independent Research Libraries - The Task Force considered the membership criteria of the Independent Research Libraries Association to be basically appropriate for use in admission to ARL. These were adapted from the ARL measures. In applying the quantitative criteria, the Task Force concludes that a candidate for ARL membership (including any IRLA members) should meet or exceed the IRLA medians (not 50% of the medians).

The Task Force recommends approval in principle of the two categories listed above. In the light of such decision and related discussion, the Task Force is prepared to formulate appropriate by-law wording, to be coordinated with approved recommendations from the Subcommittee, for action by the membership at the Fall, 1976 meeting.

Still pending in the Task Force deliberations are criteria for public library research collections. The following discussion is repeated from our report of October 15, 1975:

Public Libraries - It is recognized that not all present ARL measures are applicable and that certain specifics must be established to insure that a public library candidate has a real research base. Important in such considerations are the following:

1. Statistical criteria should be applied to central library -- branches should be excluded. Public library branch holdings are basically duplicative of the central library collections in contrast to departmental libraries in academic institutions which reflect subject specializations. Exceptions to the general rule would be subject collections

in units such as the Countee Cullen Branch, New York or George Peabody Collection, Enoch Pratt Library.

2. The central collection should have substantive subject strengths necessary to support scholarly research programs. Collection development should be broadly based and not limited to domestic or current imprints.

3. Microform holdings criteria need to be established since the acquisition of microform publications is a good indicator of research interest.

4. Categories for Central Library only:

   a) Volumes in library
   b) Number of microform units in the library. (Microform statistics are now gathered by ARL but are a not required median. For public libraries, the ARL median would be derived and used.)
   c) New monographic titles added. (The present ARL median for "volumes added" would be used but for public libraries would be applied as "titles added.")
   d) Number of current serials, including periodicals
   e) Expenditures for library materials, including binding
   f) Number of professional staff, F.T.E.
   g) Number of total staff, F.T.E.
   h) Expenditures for salaries and wages
   i) Total operating expenditures

In addition, statements would be required describing resource development objectives and functions. The Task Force is engaged in testing specific statistical measures against selected large public libraries, and will submit a further report at such time as its conclusions are reached.

Ben Bowman
John Gribbin
Philip McNiff
William S. Budington, Chairman

April 20, 1976

* * * *

APPENDIX D (1)

THE CENTER FOR RESEARCH LIBRARIES

5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
(312) 955-4545

31 March 1976

Dear Mr. Trezza:

In your capacity as Executive Director of the NCLIS I hope that you will consider seriously the attached recommendation of the Joint ARL/CRL Committee that high priority be given to the establishment of a national lending library for journals as an essential part of a systematic national program for assuring all readers of rapid and assured access to journals. The reasons for this recommendation are fully given in the Committee's report.

The Board of Directors of the Center for Research Libraries endorses the conclusion of this Joint Committee that a centralized national lending library for journals must be an essential part of any effective and rational journals access program for the nation, and its recommendation that the highest priority be given to establishing this as soon as possible. We believe that the other elements of the full program, such as state or regional nodes and systems with their more complex political and organizational problems, will fall into place more quickly, rationally, and easily after a national lending library for journals has been established, rather than before, and that the whole system will be speeded by this action.

The need for improved access to journals by all libraries, especially with their increasingly tight budgets, is urgent. The several excellent studies of the need and of possible solutions that have been sponsored by the NCLIS and the ARL, among others, have clearly established the essential and most effective basic system pattern. The details still lacking do not affect this, and it is practical and prudent to begin on the essential base now.

Finally, while we agree with the Joint ARL/CRL Committee that the present extensive journal collections of the Center for Research Libraries, its central location in the nation, its organization entirely for loan to other libraries without any responsibility to serve a local clientele first, its experience, and its established cooperative and back-up arrangements with the British Library Lending Division, make it the most logical choice either to be or to operate a U.S. national lending library for journals, our recommendation to you that the highest priority be given to establishing a central national lending library for journals is independent of the agency selected. We will solidly support any rational and effective selection. But should others concur in preferring the Center as their first choice to be choice to be the operating agency, you should know that the Center's Board of Directors is willing at least to consider such changes in its programs and organizational structure as might be required to effect this.

Yours sincerely,

Robert H Wessel

Robert H. Wessel
Chairman, Board of Directors

Mr. Alphonse F. Trezza
Executive Director
NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES
AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

RW:wmw
Enclosure

APPENDIX D (2)

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

Virginia P. Whitney
President

April 2, 1976

Mr. Alphonse F. Trezza
Executive Director
National Commission on Libraries and
Information Science
1717 K Street, N.W. Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Mr. Trezza:

I am writing to you in your capacity as chairman of the NCLIS Task Force on a National Serials System to request that you put before the Task Force the attached report of the ARL/CRL Joint Committee for a National Periodicals Lending Library. This report has been carefully studied by the ARL Executive Committee and has been endorsed by the ARL Board of Directors. It is at the direction of the Board that I am transmitting the report to you at this time.

The report rests on two propositions: first, that a central periodicals lending library should be a basic component of any national serials system and that the establishment of such an agency should have the highest priority; and second, that the Center for Research Libraries is an established facility that is already functioning as a kind of national periodicals center and that its experience, capabilities, and resources should be capitalized upon by assigning CRL the responsibility for developing, with new sources of support and a suitably modified structure, the capacity to become the national periodicals lending library component of a national serials system.

It is the hope of the ARL Board that this report can be made a part of the agenda of the NCLIS Task Force when it meets on April 5. We recognize that this is short notice, but in our view the need for a central periodicals facility is so great that there is no time to be lost in pursuing the objective.

This recommendation from the ARL Board is entirely consistent with the wishes of the ARL membership as expressed in a resolution adopted at the 87th meeting of the Association on October 16, 1975.

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
(201) 932-7505

That resolution provided warm endorsement for the report of the NCLIS entitled *Toward a National Program for Library and Information Services: Goals for Action* and urged prompt action toward the "establishment of a national center or centers for resource sharing and interlibrary lending."

The Officers and Board of the ARL appreciate the opportunity afforded the Association to participate in the important work of the NCLIS Task Force on a National Serials System. We believe that the attached report will be of positive assistance in attaining the goal of a national serials system for the nation.

Sincerely yours,

Virginia P. Whitney
President

VPW:lp

cc:

Douglas W. Bryant

John P. McDonald

APPENDIX D (3)

ARL/CRL JOINT COMMITTEE ON A NATIONAL PERIODICALS LENDING LIBRARY

Progress Report

Background

At the direction of its members, the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) moved in 1974 to expand the scope and services of its long-established periodicals lending program. In recent years strong interest in establishing a national periodicals lending library has developed within the Association of Research Libraries (ARL) and in May 1975 the membership endorsed the report of the ARL Task Force on a National Periodical Resources Plan calling for the establishment of a national periodicals lending library. With the new CRL periodicals program and the strong ARL commitment, it seemed essential that action be taken to bring together these pioneering efforts and expressed goals and that a course of action be designed to bring a national periodicals center into being.

To this end, the ARL and CRL boards agreed to form a Joint Committee for a National Periodicals Lending Library and it was appointed in November 1975. It was agreed that this planning effort should be conducted without preconceived ideas and that all feasible alternatives would be explored, but it was also understood that the Committee would draw heavily upon the efforts of the several previous committees, task forces, and other planning groups that have been active in this endeavor.

Almost simultaneously with the establishment of the ARL/CRL Joint Committee, the National Commission on Libraries and Information Sciences (NCLIS) established a Task Force to Plan a National Periodicals System. It should be noted that the two groups have different missions. The NCLIS Task Force is charged with planning a comprehensive national system of access to periodicals as part of a national network, while the ARL/CRL Joint Committee is charged with fostering and planning only one component of the periodicals access system--a central periodicals lending library. The ARL/CRL Joint Committee supports the work of the NCLIS Task Force, and seeks to expedite and facilitate the establishment of the central periodicals library because this is of such vital importance to the members of both ARL and CRL.

There is a certain urgency in the Committee's deliberations; it feels that the need for a central periodicals facility is critical--almost desperate --and that the hour is late. Research library budgets are stabilizing and even declining, while periodical costs and the number of titles continue to increase at unprecedented rates. At the same time, interlibrary loan demand on ARL and CRL libraries is rising at a time when they can least afford to absorb this increasingly heavy burden and several large libraries have already begun to impose interlibrary loan fees to recover direct costs. Effective planning must begin now if the facility is to become a reality in time to bring relief.

Deliberations and Decisions

After several long and productive meetings during which the Joint Committee reviewed and discussed all aspects of a national periodicals lending library and a national periodicals system, it has concluded that the ARL-commissioned and NSF-supported study entitled, Access to Periodicals: A National Plan by Vernon E. Palmour and others, published in February 1974 by ARL, is still the most authoritative work on the subject and provides a sound foundation upon which to base the Committee's efforts. Mr. Palmour, who is now Director of the NCLIS Task Force, had the advice and guidance of an ARL Advisory Committee and a number of other distinguished consultants. The study was based on well-conceived surveys and sound statistical methods and analysis; it developed basic design features based on the needs of the library community, and then developed and evaluated three basic configurations for a national periodicals system as follows:

1. A single new facility with a comprehensive collection, a National Periodical Resources Center modelled after the British Library Lending Division.

2. A new multi-location national system based on a number of satellite resource centers with dedicated collections of the most heavily-used titles, and a single new national center serving as the major resource in the system, and

3. A regional resource network based on designated existing library collections.

Demand estimates were projected and cost estimates developed for each configuration for a ten-year planning period. Based on the analysis of costs and other factors, the report concluded that the first configuration, a single national center, appeared to offer the best solution, and recommended that such a center be developed. Various implementation strategies were presented and after outlining the principal requirements for sponsorship the report further concluded that:

"The existing collection, central geographic location, experience, freedom of first responsibility to a local group of readers, and broad national base of support from and service to all types of libraries--university, public, government, and special--suggest the Center for Research Libraries (CRL) is a nonprofit, tax exempt, educational institution established, operated, and supported by over 70 of the major universities and public research libraries in the United States and Canada, plus nearly 60 smaller colleges, government, and industrial libraries, and the number of supporting members and associated member institutions is increasing steadily. Membership and CRL service is national in scope..." (p.153).

The Palmour report named other possible sponsors including ARL, ALA, the Library of Congress, and a new independent federal agency.

After a thorough review of possible sponsors, the Joint Committee concurred with the Palmour report and came to the firm and unanimous conclusion that the CRL, with strong ARL support, was the most appropriate agency to undertake the development of a national periodicals lending library and that it has both the willingness and the capability to do so. In the two years that have passed since the Palmour study was completed, the CRL has gained significant new experience with its expanded periodical program and its cooperative relationship with the British Library Lending Division and has strengthened itself by adding many new members.

The Joint Committee recognized that the CRL's governance and administrative structure would have to be modified, that new sources of capital and operating funding would have to be found, and that its physical facilities would have to be expanded to accommodate this important new function. It should be noted that the CRL Board is well advanced in a major planning and fund raising effort aimed at acquiring additional land and adding a new unit to its physical plant.

The Joint Committee also recognizes that a national periodical lending library associated with the CRL would only be one of the essential components of a national periodicals system, and that it would neither preclude the necessity for, nor take the place of, the various state and regional cooperative networks and systems that are in existence or being planned. It seems clear that a country as large and diverse as this one, with its strong federal structure, cannot be adequately served in the long run by a single central BLLD-like facility. The Joint Committee is equally convinced, however, that a central facility is urgently needed, that it will provide the greatest return for the dollars invested, and that it should be assigned the highest priority in building a national periodicals access system.

A recurring theme in the Committee's deliberations is the growing concern that publishers and copyright holders have about this kind of library resource sharing and how those concerns can be allayed. One major advantage of this proposal is that it would concentrate a large part of the periodical copying at a single national center and this would facilitate making whatever arrangements may be required to satisfy the provisions of the copyrighted laws.

Next Steps

The Joint Committee seeks the approval of both the ARL and CRL boards for its work to date as outlined in this report, and particularly for the selection of the CRL as the agency for developing the national periodicals lending facility. With this approval, the report should be forwarded, with appropriate endorsements, to the Chairman of the NCLIS Task Force to Plan a National Periodicals System, and that all appropriate steps be taken to gain the concurrence and support of that body for the designation of the CRL periodical facility as one of the major components of the projected national periodicals system.

It is anticipated that the Joint Committee's next efforts will be directed toward assisting in developing funding sources and further promoting the concept of a periodicals center associated with CRL.

It will also lend its support to the extension and expansion of the CRL's present periodicals program so that it can become the foundation and prototype of the full-scale operation when and as additional funding and space are secured.

Warrren J. Haas
Arthur Hamlin
Stephen A. McCarthy
John P. McDonald
Robert Wessel
Virginia P. Whitney
Gordon Williams
Richard De Gennaro, Vice Chairman
Douglas W. Bryant, Chairman

March 29, 1976

* * * *

APPENDIX E

ATTENDANCE AT 88th ARL MEETING

University of Alabama Libraries
James F. Wyatt

University of Alberta Library
Mohan L. Sharma

University of Arizona Library
W. David Laird

Arizona State University Library
Donald Koepp

Boston Public Library
Philip J. McNiff

Boston University Library
John Laucus

Brigham Young University
Donald K. Nelson

University of British Columbia Library
Bill Watson

University of California Library
(Berkeley) Richard Dougherty

University of California Library
(Davis) Bernard Kreissman

University of Calfironia Library
(Los Angeles) Page Ackerman

University of California Library
(San Diego) Melvin J. Voigt

University of California Library
(Santa Barbara) Donald Davidson

Case Western Reserve University Library
James V. Jones

University of Chicago Library
Stanley McElderry

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Harold Schell

University of Colorado Library
Leo Cabell

Colorado State University Library
Le Moyne W. Anderson

Columbia University Libraries
Warren J. Haas

Cornell University Libraries
Ryburn M. Ross

Dartmouth College Libraries
Edward C. Lathem

Emory University Library
Don L. Bosseau

University of Florida Libraries
Gustave A. Harrer

Florida State University Library
Charles Miller

Georgetown University Library
Joseph E. Jeffs

University of Georgia Libraries
Warren N. Boes

Harvard University Library
Douglas W. Bryant

University of Hawaii Library
Stanley L. West

University of Houston Libraries
Ronald P. Naylor

Howard University Libraries
Binford H. Conley

University of Illinois Library
Robert Oram

Indiana University Libraries
W. Carl Jackson

University of Iowa Libraries
Leslie W. Dunlap

Iowa State University Library
Warren Kuhn

John Crerar Library
William S. Budington

Johns Hopkins University Library
David Stam

Joint University Libraries
Frank P. Grisham

University of Kansas Library
James Ranz

University of Kentucky Libraries
Mary Ruth Brown

Kent State University Libraries
Hyman W. Kritzer

Library of Congress
William Welsh

Linda Hall Library
Thomas D. Gillies

Louisiana State University Library
George Guidry , Jr.

McGill University Library
Marianne Scott

McMaster University Library
William Ready

University of Maryland Library
H. Joanne Harrar

University of Massachusetts Library
Richard J. Talbot

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Libraries Jay Lucker

University of Michigan Library
Robin Downs

Michigan State University Library
Richard Chapin

University of Minnesota Libraries
Ralph H. Hopp

University of Missouri Library
Dwight Tuckwood

National Agricultural Library
Richard A. Farley

National Library of Canada
Joseph Guy Sylvestre

University of Nebraska Libraries
Gerald A. Rudolph

New York Public Library
Richard W. Couper

University of North Carolina Libraries
James F. Govan

Northwestern University Libraries
John P. McGowan

University of Notre Dame Libraries
David Donovan

Ohio State University Libraries
Larry X. Besant

University of Oklahoma Library
James K. Zink

Oklahoma State University Library
Roscoe Rouse

University of Oregon Library
H. William Axford

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Richard De Gennaro

Pennsylvania State University Library
Stuart Forth

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Oxanna Kaufman

Princeton University Library
Richard Boss

Purdue University Library
Joseph M. Dagnese

Queen's University Library
Donald A. Redmond

Rice University Library
Richard L. O'Keeffe

University of Rochester Libraries
Ben Bowman

Rutgers University Library
Virginia P. Whitney

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Russell Shank

University of South Carolina
Kenneth E. Toombs

University of Southern California Library
Roy L. Kidman

Southern Illinois University Library
Sidney Matthews

Stanford University Libraries
David C. Weber

State University of New York at Albany
C. James Schmidt

State University of New York at Buffalo
Eldred Smith

Syracuse University Libraries
Donald Anthony

Temple University Library
Arthur Hamlin

University of Tennessee Libraries
Donald R. Hunt

University of Texas Libraries
Merle N. Boylan

University of Toronto Libraries
Robert Blackburn

University of Utah Libraries
Roger Hanson

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
University H. Gordon Bechanan

University of Virginia Libraries
Ray Frantz, Jr.

University of Washington Library
Marion A. Milczewski

Washington State University Library
G. Donald Smith

Washington University Libraries
William Kurth

Wayne State University Libraries
Vern M. Pings

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.

Yale University Libraries
Donald B. Engley

Members Not Represented:

Brown University Library
Center for Research Libraries
University of Connecticut Library
Duke University Libraries
National Library of Medicine
New York State Library
New York University Libraries
State University of New York at Stony Brook
Texas A & M University Library
Tulane University Library
University of Western Ontario

Guests

Kenneth Allen, University of Washington Library
Calvin Boyer, University of Mississippi
Jean Boyer, CLR Intern/University of California, L.A.
Margaret Child, National Endowment for the Humanities
Fred Cole, Council on Library Resources
George Farr, National Endowment for the Humanities
Frederick Kilgour, Ohio College Library Center
Ruth Kirk, University of Washington
Lawrence Livingston, Council on Library Resources
Karl Lo, University of Washington
Beverly Lynch, Association of College & Research Libraries
Susan Martin, University of California, Berkeley
Mary Jane Reed, Washington State Library
Stephen Salmon, University of California
James Skipper, Research Libraries Group
Carl Spaulding, Council on Library Resources
Richard Sullivan, Carnegie Corporation of New York
Alphonse Trezza, National Commission on Libraries & Information Science
Robert Vosper, University of California, Los Angeles
David Watkins, Brandeis University Library

ARL Staff:

John P. McDonald, Executive Director
John Lorenz, Executive Director Designate
Suzanne Frankie, Assistant Executive Director
Duane E. Webster, Director, Office of University Library Management Studies
Jeffrey Gardner, Management Research Specialist
P.K. Yu, Director, Center for Chinese Research Materials

APPENDIX F

OFFICERS, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, COMMISSIONS, COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES OF THE ARL

ARL Officers and Board for 1976

Virginia P. Whitney, President
Edward C. Lathem, Vice President & President-elect
Richard De Gennaro, Past President
Page Ackerman (Oct. 1976)
Richard Boss (Oct. 1977)
Richard A. Farley (Oct. 1978)
Ray Frantz, Jr. (Oct. 1978)
Gustave A. Harrer (Oct. 1976)
Richard O'Keeffe (Oct. 1976)
Russell Shank (Oct. 1977)
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr. (Oct. 1978)

ARL COMMISSIONS*

1. Commission on Development of Resources

Page Ackerman (Oct. 1977)
Gormly Miller (Oct. 1978)
Gustave Harrer, Chairman (Oct. 1976)

2. Commission on Organization of Resources

Joseph Dagnese (Oct. 1977)
John McGowan (Oct. 1976)
Edward C. Lathem, Chairman (1977)

3. Commission on Access to Resources

Hugh Atkinson (Oct. 1977)
Leslie Dunlap (Oct. 1978)
Richard Boss, Chairman (Oct. 1976)

4. Commission on Management of Research Libraries

Richard Dougherty (Oct. 1977)
Stanley McElderry (Oct. 1977)
Russell Shank, Chairman (Oct. 1977)

5. ARL Executive Committee

Richard De Gennaro, Past President
John P. McDonald, Executive Director
John G. Lorenz, Executive Director Designate
Edward C. Lathem, Vice President & President-elect
Virginia P. Whitney, President, Chairman

*The Commission on External Affairs was temporarily suspended in February 1975.

ARL STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Access to Manuscripts and Rare Books

William Bond
William Cagle
C. Herbert Finch
John Finzi
Leslie Dunlap
Ray Frantz, Jr., Chairman

Committee on Center for Chinese Research Materials

Roy Hofheinz, Jr.
Ying-mao Kau
David T. Roy
Weiying Wan
Eugene Wu
Philip McNiff, Chairman

Committee on Federal Relations

Warren N. Boes
Richard Couper
Joseph Jeffs
Philip McNiff
Paul Willis

Committee on Foreign Newspapers on Microfilm

Gustave Harrer
Bruce Peel
Gordon Williams
John Lorenz, Chairman

Committee on Interlibrary Loan

Richard Chapin
Ruth Kirk
John Humphry
Jay Lucker
David Weber, Chairman

National Program for Acquisitions and Cataloging Liaison Committee

Philip McNiff
Howard Sullivan
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr.
Frederick Wagman, Chairman

ARL/CRL Joint Committee for a National Periodicals Lending Library

Warren Haas
Arthur Hamlin
John McDonald
Robert Wessel
Virginia P. Whitney
Gordon Williams
Richard De Gennaro, Vice Chairman
Douglas Bryant, Chairman

Committee on Negro Academic Libraries

Arthur Hamlin
Warren Boes, Chairman

Committee on Nominations

ARL Vice President, Chairman

Committee on Preservation of Research Libraries Materials

David Stam, Chairman

ARL/ACRL Joint Committee on University Library Standards

Calvin Boyer
William Kurth
Stanley McElderry
Richard Talbot
Melvin Voigt
David Watkins
Eldred Smith, Chairman

ARL SUBCOMMITTEES

Subcommittee to Review the Criteria for Membership in ARL

Gustave A. Harrer
Stanley McElderry
Page Ackerman, Chairman

ARL COMMITTEES ON FOREIGN ACQUISITIONS

Africa

J.M.D. Crossey, Yale
Peter Duignan, Hoover Institution on War, Peace and Revolution
Esther J. Walls, SUNY, Stony Brook
Julian Witherell, Library of Congress
Hans Panofsky, Northwestern University, Chairman

Middle East

George N. Atiyeh, Library of Congress
James Pollack, University of Indiana
David H. Partington, Harvard University, Chairman

Eastern Europe

Joseph A. Placek, University of Michigan
Paul Horecky, Library of Congress
Marion Milczewski, University of Washington, Chairman

East Asia

Weying Wan, University of Michigan
Eugene Wu, Harvard University
Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress, Chairman

South Asia

Richard De Gennaro, University of Pennsylvania
Paul Fasana, New York Public Library
Maureen Patterson, University of Chicago
Louis A. Jacob, Library of Congress, Chairman

Southeast Asia

Charles Bryant, Yale University
John Musgrave, University of Michigan

Latin America

Nettie Lee Benson, University of Texas
Donald Wisdom, Library of Congress
Carl W. Deal, University of Illinois, Chairman

Western Europe

Norman Dudley, University of California - Los Angeles
Ten-Tsai Feng, Boston Public Library
William H. Kurth, Washington University - St. Louis
Howard Sullivan, Wayne State University, Chairman

ARL TASK FORCES

Task Force on Criteria for Nonuniversity Membership in ARL

Ben Bowman
John Gribbin
Philip McNiff
William Budington, Chairman

Task Force on NEH Research Tools Program

Richard Dougherty
James Henderson
Hyman W. Kritzer
David Sparks
W. David Laird, Chairman

Task Force to Study the ARL Commission Structure

Ray Frantz, Jr.
W. David Laird
Stanley McElderry
Basil Stuart-Stubbs
Ralph H. Hopp, Cahirman

REPRESENTATIVES

ANSI Committee Z-39	To be appointed
CONSER Project	Ryburn Ross
Joint Committee on Union List of Serials	William Budington
Joint Statistics Coordinating Committee	Donald Koepp
United States Book Exchange	Joanne Harrar

APPENDIX G

MEMBERSHIP OF ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

May 1976

University of Alabama Libraries
P.O. Box S
University, Alabama 35486
James F. Wyatt, Dean of Libraries
(205) 348-5298

University of Alberta Library
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Bruce Peel, Director
(403) 432-3790

University of Arizona Library
Tucson, Arizona 85721
W. David Laird, Librarian
(602) 884-2101

Arizona State University Library
Tempe, Arizona 85281
Donald Koepp, Librarian
(602) 965-3415

Boston Public Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02117
Philip J. McNiff, Librarian
(617) 536-5400

Boston University Library
Boston, Massachusetts 02215
John Laucus, Director
(617) 353-3710

Brigham Young University
324 Lee Library
Provo, Utah 84602
Donald K. Nelson, Director
(801) 374-1211 Ext. 2905

University of British Columbia Library
Vancouver, B.C., Canada V6T 1W5
Basil Stuart-Stubbs, Librarian
(604) 228-2298

Brown University Library
Providence, Rhode Island 02912
Charles Churchwell, Librarian
(401) 863-2162

University of California Library
Berkeley, California 94720
Richard Dougherty, Librarian
(415) 642-3773

University of California Library
Davis, California 95616
Bernard Kreissman, Librarian
(916) 752-2110

University of California Library
Los Angeles, California 90024
Page Ackerman, Librarian
(213) 825-1201

University of California, San Diego
The University Library
La Jolla, California 92037
Melvin J. Voigt, Librarian
(714) 452-3061

University of California, Santa Barbara
Santa Barbara, California 93106
Donald Davidson, Librarian
(805) 961-3256

Case Western Reserve University Libraries
Cleveland, Ohio 55106
James V. Jones, Director
(216) 368-2990

Center for Research Libraries
5721 Cottage Grove Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Gordon R. Williams, Director
(312) 955-4545

University of Chicago Library
Chicago, Illinois 60637
Stanley McElderry, Director
(312) 753-2933

University of Cincinnati Libraries
Cincinnati, Ohio 45221
Harold Schell, Dean, Library Admin. &
Director of Libraries (513) 475-2533

University of Colorado Library
Boulder, Colorado 80304
Leo Cabell, Acting Director
(303) 492-7511

Colorado State University Library
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Le Moyne W. Anderson, Director
(303) 491-5911

Columbia University Libraries
New York, New York 10027
Warren J. Haas, Vice President & Libn.
(212) 280-2247

University of Connecticut Library
Storrs, Connecticut 06268
Norman D. Stevens, Acting Director
(203) 486-2219

Cornell University Libraries
Ithaca, New York 14850
J. Gormly Miller, Director
(607) 256-3689

Dartmouth College Libraries
Hanover, New Hampshire 03755
Edward C. Lathem, Librarian
(603) 646-2236

Duke University Libraries
Durham, North Carolina 27706
Connie R. Dunlap, Librarian
(919) 684-2034

Emory University Library
Atlanta, Georgia 30322
Don L. Bosseau, Director
(404) 377-2411 Ext. 7691

University of Florida Libraries
Gainesville, Florida 32603
Gustave A. Harrer, Director
(904) 392-0341

Florida State University Library
Tallahassee, Florida 32306
Charles Miller, Director
(904) 644-5211

Georgetown University Library
Washington, D. C. 20007
Joseph E. Jeffs, Director
(202) 625-4095

University of Georgia Libraries
Athens, Georgia 30601
Warren N. Boes, Director
(404) 542-2716

Harvard University Library
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138
Douglas W. Bryant, Director
(617) 495-2404

University of Hawaii Library
2550 The Mall
Honolulu, Hawaii 96822
Stanley L. West, University Librarian
(808) 958-7205

University of Houston Libraries
Houston, Texas 77004
Ronald P. Naylor, Acting Director
(713) 749-2340

Howard University Libraries
Washington, D. C. 20001
Binford H. Conley, Director
(202) 636-7234

University of Illinois Library
Urbana, Illinois 61803
Robert Oram, Associate Librarian
(217) 333-0790

Indiana University Libraries
Bloomington, Indiana 47405
W. Carl Jackson, Dean of Libraries
(812) 337-3404

University of Iowa Libraries
Iowa City, Iowa 52240
Leslie W. Dunlap, Dean of Library Admin.
(319) 353-4450

Iowa State University Library
Ames, Iowa 50011
Warren Kuhn, Dean of Library Services
(515) 294-1442

John Crerar Library
Chicago, Illinois 60616
William S. Budington, Director
(312) 225-2526

Johns Hopkins University Library
The Milton S. Eisenhower Library
Baltimore, Maryland 21218
David Stam, Librarian
(301) 366-3300 Ex. 801

Joint University Libraries
Nashville, Tennessee 37203
Frank P. Grisham, Director
(615) 322-2834

University of Kansas Library
Lawrence, Kansas 66044
James Ranz, Dean of Libraries
(913) 864-3601

University of Kentucky Libraries
Lexington, Kentucky 40506
Paul Willis, Director
(606) 257-3801

Kent State University Libraries
Kent, Ohio 44242
Hyman W. Kritzer, Assistant Provost &
Director of Libraries (216) 672-2962

Library of Congress
Washington, D. C. 20540
Daniel J. Boorstin, Librarian
(202) 426-5205

Linda Hall Library
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
Thomas D. Gillies, Director
(816) 363-4600

Louisiana State University Library
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803
George Guidry Jr., Director
(504) 388-3969

McGill University Library
Montreal, P.Q., Canada H3C 3G1
Marianne Scott, Director
(514) 392-4949

McMaster University
1280 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada L85 4L6
William Ready, University Librarian
(416) 525-9140 Local 4781

University of Maryland Library
College Park, Maryland 20742
H. Joanne Harrar, Librarian
(301) 454-3011

University of Massachusetts Libraries
Amherst, Massachusetts 01002
Richard J. Talbot, Director
(413) 545-0284

Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Libraries
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139
Jay Lucker, Director
(617) 253-5651

University of Michigan Library
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104
Frederick H. Wagman, Director
(313) 764-9356

Michigan State University Library
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
Richard Chapin, Librarian
(517) 355-2341

University of Minnesota Libraries
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
Ralph H. Hopp, Director
(612) 373-3097

University of Missouri Library
Columbia, Missouri 65201
Dwight Tuckwood, Director
(314) 882-2739

National Agricultural Library
Beltsville, Maryland 20705
Richard A. Farley, Director
(301) 344-3779

National Library of Canada
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario, Canada K1A 0N4
Joseph Guy Sylvestre, Librarian
(613) 992-0401

National Library of Medicine
Bethesda, Maryland 20014
Martin M. Cummings, Director
(301) 496-6221

University of Nebraska Libraries
Lincoln, Nebraska 68508
Gerald A. Rudolph, Dean of Libraries
(402) 472-7211

New York Public Library
New York, New York 10018
Richard W. Couper, President
(212) 695-3231

New York State Library
State Education Department
Albany, New York 12224
John A. Humphry, Asst. Commissioner for
Libraries (518) 474-5930

New York University Libraries
New York, New York 10003
Julius J. Marke, Acting Librarian
(212) 598-2140

University of North Carolina Libraries
Chapel Hill, North Carolina 27515
James F. Govan, Director
(919) 933-1301

Northwestern University Libraries
Evanston, Illinois 60210
John P. McGowan, Librarian
(312) 492-7640

University of Notre Dame Libraries
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
David E. Sparks, Director
(219) 283-7317

Ohio State University Libraries
Columbus, Ohio 43210
Hugh Atkinson, Director
(614) 422-6152

University of Oklahoma Library
Norman, Oklahoma 73069
James K. Zink, Director
(405) 325-2611 or 2614

Oklahoma State University Library
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74075
Roscoe Rouse, Librarian
(405) 372-6211 Ext. 237

University of Oregon Library
Eugene, Oregon 97403
H. William Axford
University Librarian
(503) 686-3056

University of Pennsylvania Libraries
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19174
Richard De Gennaro, Director
(215) 243-7091

Pennsylvania State University Library
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802
Stuart Forth, Dean of Univ. Libraries
(814) 865-0401

University of Pittsburgh Libraries
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15260
Glenora Edwards Rossell, Director
(412) 624-4401

Princeton University Library
Princeton, New Jersey 08540
Richard Boss, Librarian
(609) 452-3190

Purdue University Library
Lafayette, Indiana 47907
Joseph M. Dagnese, Director
(317) 749-2571

Queen's University
Douglas Library
Kingston, Canada K7L 5C4
Donald A. Redmond, Chief Librarian
(613) 547-5950

Rice University Library
6100 S. Main
Box 1892
Houston, Texas 77001
Richard L. O'Keeffe, Librarian
(713) 527-4022

University of Rochester Libraries
Rochester, New York 14627
Ben Bowman, Director
(716) 275-4463

Rutgers University Library
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08901
Virginia P Whitney, Librarian
(201) 932-7505

Smithsonian Institution Libraries
Constitution Avenue at Tenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20560
Russell Shank, Director
(202) 381-5496

University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208
Kenneth E. Toombs, Director of Libraries
(803) 777-3142

University of Southern California Library
Los Angeles, California 90007
Roy L. Kidman, Librarian
(618) 453-2522

Southern Illinois University Library
Carbondale, Illinois 62901
Kenneth G. Peterson, Dean of Library Affairs
(618) 453-2522

Stanford University Libraries
Stanford, California 94305
David C. Weber, Director
(415) 497-2016

State University of New York at Albany
1400 Washington Avenue
Albany, New York 12222
C. James Schmidt, Director of Libraries
(518) 457-8540

State University of New York at Buffalo Libraries
Buffalo, New York 14214
Eldred Smith, Director of Libraries
(716) 831-4205

State University of New York at Stony Brook Libraries
Stony Brook, New York 11790
John B. Smith, Director & Dean of Libraries
(516) 246-5650

Syracuse University Libraries
Syracuse, New York 13210
Donald Anthony, Director
(315) 423-2574

Temple University Library
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19122
Arthur Hamlin, Director
(215) 787-8231

University of Tennessee Libraries
Knoxville, Tennessee 37916
Donald R. Hunt, Director
(615) 974-4127

University of Texas Libraries
Austin, Texas 78712
Merle N. Boylan, Director
(512) 471-3561

Texas A & M University Library
College Station, Texas 77843
Irene B. Hoadley, Director
(713) 845-6111

University of Toronto Libraries
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 1A5
Robert Blackburn, Director
(416) 928-2292

Tulane University Library
New Orleans, Louisiana 70118
John H. Gribbin, Director
(504) 865-5131

University of Utah Libraries
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112
Roger Hanson, Director
(801) 581-8558

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
Blacksburg, Virginia 24061
H. Gordon Bechanan, Director of Libraries (703) 951-5593

University of Virginia Libraries
Charlottesville, Virginia 22903
Ray Frantz, Jr., Librarian
(804) 925-3026

University of Washington Library
Seattle, Washington 98105
Marion A. Milczewski, Director
(206) 543-1760

Washington State University Library
Pullman, Washington 99105
G. Donald Smith, Director
(509) 335-4557

Washington University Libraries
St. Louis, Missouri 63130
William Kurth, Librarian
(314) 863-0100 Ext. 4523

Wayne State University Libraries
Detroit, Michigan 48202
Vern M. Pings, Director
(313) 577-4020

University of Western Ontario Libraries
London 72, Canada
Robert Lee, Director
(519) 629-3165

University of Wisconsin Libraries
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
Joseph H. Treyz, Jr., Director
(608) 262-3521

Yale University Libraries
New Haven, Connecticut 06520
Rutherford D. Rogers, Librarian
(203) 436-2456

APPENDIX H

AUDITOR'S REPORT

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

REPORT ON FINANCIAL STATEMENTS
(with supplemental material)

TWO YEARS ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1975

Seidman & Seidman
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS

Seidman & Seidman
CERTIFIED PUBLIC ACCOUNTANTS
1200–18th Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036 (202) 293-1570

January 19, 1976

Board of Directors
Association of Research Libraries
Washington, D. C.

We have examined the statement of assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries as of December 31, 1975 and 1974, and the related statements of receipts and disbursements and changes in fund balances for the years then ended. Our examination was made in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards, and accordingly included such tests of the accounting records and such other auditing procedures as we considered necessary in the circumstances.

The financial statements of the Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project were examined by other auditors whose report has been furnished to us. Our opinion, insofar as it relates to the amounts included for this project, is based solely upon the report of the other auditors.

These statements have been prepared on the cash receipts and disbursements basis, and, as a result, omit material assets and liabilities. Accordingly, they do not, in our opinion, present financial position and results of operations as they would had generally accepted accrual basis accounting principles been applied in their preparation.

Offices Throughout the United States • Representation in Other Parts of the World through Binder Seidman International

In our opinion, based upon our examination and the report of the other auditors, the accompanying statements present fairly the assets and liabilities of the Association of Research Libraries at December 31, 1975 and 1974, arising from cash transactions, and the recorded cash receipts and disbursements and changes in fund balances of the Association during the years then ended, on a consistent basis.

Seidman + Seidman

Certified Public Accountants

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF ASSETS AND LIABILITIES

	December 31,	
ASSETS	1975	1974
Cash in bank and on hand	$ 3 400	$ 37 366
Cash in savings account	29 813	9 350
Cash held by others - agency fund	50 711	76 888
Savings certificates	455 504	322 802
Deposits	292	368
	$539 720	$446 774
LIABILITIES		
Payroll taxes withheld	$ 74	$ 2 579
Special programs for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	64 112	39 505
Total liabilities	64 186	42 084
FUND BALANCES		
General Operating Fund	137 761	110 771
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	50 711	76 888
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	287 062	217 031
Total fund balances	475 534	404 690
	$539 720	$446 774

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1975	Year ended December 31, 1974 (restated)
RECEIPTS:		
Dues	$206 000	$184 000
Interest	16 678	12 906
Publications	9 762	8 238
Royalties	42	825
Miscellaneous	351	-
Total receipts	232 833	205 969
DISBURSEMENTS	231 318	220 718
Less administrative expenses charged to special programs	25 475	15 000
Net disbursements	205 843	205 718
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	$ 26 990	$ 251

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31,	
	1975	1974
RECEIPTS:		
Dues	$ 71 374	$ 72 527
Sales to members and non-members	62 104	76 429
Interest	3 002	5 300
Totals	136 480	154 256
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Purchases for members and non-members	53 710	58 468
Newspapers and microfilm	56 256	87 187
Salaries	40 134	32 944
Royalties	4 249	74
Payroll taxes	3 388	2 963
Storage	1 760	1 950
Supplies	1 724	1 656
Insurance	700	617
Professional fees	700	650
Miscellaneous	36	136
Totals	162 657	186 645
EXCESS OF DISBURSEMENTS OVER RECEIPTS	$ 26 177	$ 32 389

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND
STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31,	
	1975	1974 (restated)
RECEIPTS:		
Sale of publications	$192 068	$128 201
Interest income	20 675	14 533
	212 743	142 734
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Cost of publications	111 193	82 080
Postage and other expenses	2 585	2 167
Transfer to Center for Chinese Research Materials program	28 934	-
	142 712	84 247
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER DISBURSEMENTS	$ 70 031	$ 58 487

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN FUND BALANCES

	Year ended December 31, 1975	Year ended December 31, 1974 (restated)
GENERAL OPERATING FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$110 771	$121 246
ADD - excess of receipts over disbursements	26 990	251
- transfer from Chinese Center Revolving Fund in respect of project overhead	-	17 552
	137 761	139 049
LESS - excess of disbursements over receipts on completed project (Inter-Library Loan - N.S.F.)	-	4 603
- transfer to Chinese Center Revolving Fund in respect of interest earned on invested cash	-	23 675
	-	28 278
BALANCE, at end of year	$137 761	$110 771
FOREIGN NEWSPAPER MICROFILM PROJECT AGENCY FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$ 76 888	$109 277
LESS - excess of disbursements over receipts	26 177	32 389
BALANCE, at end of year	$ 50 711	$ 76 888
CHINESE CENTER REVOLVING FUND:		
BALANCE, at beginning of year	$217 031	$152 421
ADD - excess of receipts over disbursements	70 031	58 487
- transfer from General Operating Fund in respect of prior years' interest earned on invested cash	-	23 675
	287 062	234 583
LESS - transfer to General Operating Fund in respect of project overhead	-	17 552
BALANCE, at end of year	$287 062	$217 031

See accompanying notes to financial statements.

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

NOTES TO FINANCIAL STATEMENTS

SUMMARY OF ACCOUNTING POLICIES

Basis of accounting

The accounts of the Association are maintained on a cash basis of accounting. Under this method, effect is given only to cash collections and payments. Accordingly, the financial statements do not show accrued income, costs and expenses, and the receivables and payables that would result from such accruals.

Office equipment

The Association charges payments for office equipment in full to current operations and shows no equipment in its accounts.

INCOME TAXES

The absence of a provision for income taxes is due to the Association's exemption from federal income tax under Section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

LEASE

Annual rental of $20,058 is payable for the Association's office premises on a lease expiring June 30, 1976.

Total rent and storage charges were $19,999 for 1975 and $17,591 for 1974.

RESTATEMENT OF PRIOR YEAR AMOUNTS

The 1974 statements of receipts and disbursements of the General Operating Fund and the Chinese Center Revolving Fund and their related statements of changes in fund balances have been restated to reflect the allocation of 1974 interest income, in the amount of $14,533, as a revenue item of the Chinese Center Revolving Fund rather than a transfer between funds. The restatement does not change 1974 ending fund balances.

SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Our examination of the financial statements included in the preceding section of this report was directed to an expression of our opinion on those statements taken as a whole. The supplemental material presented in the following section of this report has been subjected to certain audit procedures applied in connection with our examination of the financial statements. This information, while not considered necessary for the fair presentation of the statements of assets and liabilities and receipts and disbursements of the Association, is, in our opinion, fairly stated in all material respects when considered in relation to the financial statements taken as a whole.

Seidman & Seidman

Certified Public Accountants

Washington, D. C.
January 19, 1976

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

GENERAL OPERATING FUND
SCHEDULE OF DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1975	Year ended December 31, 1974
Board and committee expenses	$ 7 291	$ 7 784
Conference expense	14 585	9 952
Dues	2 221	2 169
Equipment purchases	191	818
Honorarium	1 024	600
Hospitalization	1 308	1 519
Insurance and bonding	1 727	2 986
Miscellaneous	190	572
Payroll taxes	4 620	4 757
Periodicals and subscriptions	884	854
Printing	12 242	11 481
Professional fees	28 113	24 633
Postage and freight	2 369	2 386
Rent	7 461	6 466
Retirement plan	10 799	9 383
Salaries	99 795	105 551
Staff travel and expenses	5 030	2 871
Stationery and office expenses	6 804	7 220
Telephone	4 664	3 716
Funding for special programs - University Library Management Study Office	20 000	15 000
Totals	$231 318	$220 718

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

SPECIAL PROGRAMS
SCHEDULE OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS

	Year ended December 31, 1975	
	Center for Chinese Research Materials	
	(National Endowment for the Humanities)	(Mellon Foundation)
RECEIPTS:		
Grants	$68 000	$100 000
Convention income		
Sale of publications		
Transfer from General Operating Fund		
Transfer from Chinese Center Revolving Fund	28 934	
Management Institutes		
Film service (net)		
Interest income		
Totals	96 934	100 000
DISBURSEMENTS:		
Allocated administrative fees	13 009	7 466
Consulting fees		
Contractor fees		
Convention expenses		
Employee benefits	8 483	2 803
Equipment purchases		
Miscellaneous		7
Office expenses	2 802	1 213
Payroll taxes	4 071	1 181
Periodicals and subscriptions	156	119
Postage	36	173
Printing	1 008	1 193
Regional workshops (net)		
Rent and storage	5 370	2 903
Salaries and investigator fees	60 366	29 025
Telephone	596	316
Training (net)		
Travel	3 753	1 642
Totals	99 650	48 041
EXCESS OF RECEIPTS OVER (UNDER) DISBURSEMENTS	(2 716)	51 959
PROGRAM BALANCE - BEGINNING	2 716	-0-
	-0-	51 959
TRANSFER TO EQUITY ACCOUNT		
PROGRAM BALANCE - ENDING	$ -0-	$ 51 959

Year ended December 31, 1975				
University Library Management Study Office	Brasenose II Conference	I.F.L.A. Conference	Total	Year ended December 31, 1974 Total
$ 81 774	$ -	$ -	$249 774	$235 431
		10 513	10 513	98 186
26 347			26 347	17 383
20 000			20 000	15 000
			28 934	-
1 710			1 710	980
2 788			2 788	-
	51		51	-
132 619	51	10 513	340 117	366 980
5 000			25 475	15 000
				362
				23 367
		36 575	36 575	110 124
8 824			20 110	15 679
996			996	564
777			784	1 233
4 826			8 841	11 104
3 657			8 909	6 798
666			941	1 074
2 933			3 142	1 843
18 495			20 696	22 918
401			401	-
4 265			12 538	11 125
68 835			158 226	125 282
4 354			5 266	4 612
1 805			1 805	576
5 410			10 805	10 506
131 244		36 575	315 510	362 167
1 375	51	(26 062)	24 607	4 813
6 979	3 748	26 062	39 505	30 089
8 354	3 799	-0-	64 112	34 902
				4 603
$ 8 354	$3 799	$ -0-	$ 64 112	$ 39 505

ASSOCIATION OF RESEARCH LIBRARIES

PROOF OF CASH
YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31, 1975

CASH BALANCE, beginning	$446 774
ADD - Excess of receipts over (under) disbursements:	
Special programs for which the Association is accountable to the grantors	24 607
General Operating Fund	26 989
Foreign Newspaper Microfilm Project Agency Fund	(26 177)
Chinese Center Revolving Fund	70 032
Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1975 paid January 1976	74
	542 299
LESS - Payroll taxes fourth quarter 1974 paid January 1975	2 579
CASH BALANCE, ending	$539 720

Minutes of the meetings of the Association of Research Libraries are published semiannually. Subscription rates for U.S.A. and possessions are $10.00 a year; $5.00 an issue (foreign: $11.20 a year; $6.20 an issue). Checks should be made payable to the Association of Research Libraries, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue, N. W., Washington, D. C. 20036.

Association of Research Libraries.
Minutes of the meeting. 1st–
Dec. 1932–
[Princeton, N. J., etc.]

v. 28 cm.

Meetings are numbered irregularly: 9th–10th, 12th called respectively: 10th–11th, 13th.
Indexes:
Subject index.

1st–42d, Dec. 1932–Jan. 1954. 1 v.

Z673.A84 59–30046

Library of Congress [8]

These Minutes are printed on a stable and enduring paper.